The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1929 No. 3346

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 181
EDITORIALS:
The Decline of Massachusetts 184
Baby Motor Cars 185
The Muzzle in China 185
Enter Cupid 186
IT SEEMS TO HEYWOOD BROUN 187
FORGETTING SACCO AND VANZETTI. By Waldo L. Cook 188
THE POWER OF TWO GHOSTS. By Gardner Jackson 190
A GREAT EDITOR. By John A. Hobson 192
AMERICAN OR FOREIGNER? By J. Mark Jacobson 193
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 195
CORRESPONDENCE 196
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 197
BOOKS AND FILMS:
There Yet Survived A God. By Robert P. Tristram Coffin 198
Beginnings of Empire. By Robert Livingston Schuyler 198
Underworld. By Dudley Nichols 199
Meddling Through. By Clarence Britten 199
The Poems of Malcolm Cowley. By Morton Dauwen Zabel 200
Labor and Internationalism. By J. A. Hobson 201
A Boswell to Foch. By William MacDonald 201
Books in Brief 202
Films: There *Are* Silent Pictures. By Alexander Bakshy 203
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
Reparations: The Young and Dawes Plans. By William MacDonald 205

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor
HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor
Associate Editors
ARTHUR WARNER
DOROTHY VAN DOREN PAUL BLANSHARD
Dramatic Editor Literary Editor
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH FREDA KIRCHWEY
Contributing Editors
JOHN A. HOBSON HEYWOOD BROUN H. L. MENCKEN
NORMAN THOMAS LEWIS S. GANNETT CARL VAN DOREN
MARK VAN DOREN LUDWIG LEWISOHN
DAVID BOEHM, Advertising Manager

Subscription Rates: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50; and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City, Cable Address: Nation, New York. British Agent of Subscriptions and Advertising, Miss Gertrude M. Cross, 34, Clifton Gardens, W. 9, London, England.

MR. SNOWDEN'S OUTSPOKEN ATTACK upon the Young plan, in the conference at The Hague, was both unexpected and disconcerting, the more so because he spoke with the full approval of the MacDonald Government. Unfortunately, the complete text of Mr. Snowden's speech on August 6 was not cabled to this country, and the public could not know fully upon what facts or claims he based his severe criticism of the plan. Nor have we as yet the correspondence that was exchanged between the governments when the Young committee was appointed, and so cannot tell whether, as Mr. Snowden is reported to have alleged, the committee was debarred from changing the percentages agreed upon at Spa in July, 1920, for distributing reparation payments, or was subjected to any other restrictions. The New York *World* remarked the other day that if France had been the one to raise objections it would probably have been taken as a matter of course, but that a vigorous dissent voiced by Great Britain was promptly greeted as something surprising. As this issue of *The Nation* went to press the situation seemed to be one calling for a suspension of judgment until all the facts were known. It might at least have occurred to the correspondents who filled their dispatches with hostile criticism of Great Britain that the MacDonald Government was not likely to kick the Young scheme to one side and condemn Germany and Europe to an indefinite continuance of the Dawes plan without reasons. At the same time the correspondents only expressed the general feeling of disappointment, shared by *The Nation,* at the possibility of the wreck of the Young plan, a scheme which had been accepted by representatives of all the nations concerned and embodied a definite settlement of the ten-year dispute over the war debts and reparations.

SEVEN YEARS AGO the British proclaimed Egypt "an independent sovereign state," but they simultaneously informed the Powers that nothing was changed by this form of words, that they would continue the "special relations" with Egypt "long recognized by other governments" and, in particular, would continue to police Egypt and to protect foreign interests there. In other words, Egypt was sovereign and independent except as concerned her internal and external affairs. Since that declaration British troops have on sundry occasions seized the Egyptian customs, marched up to the parliament house, taken over control of the Sudan, and forced dissolution of Parliament. These facts are important to recall as the background of the new Anglo-Egyptian proposals. The new agreement begins with another fine phrase: "The military occupation of Egypt by forces of His Britannic Majesty is terminated." It continues by explaining that this does not apply to the shores of the Red Sea and the banks of the Suez Canal, that Egypt must be Britain's ally in peace and in war, and in the event of war *or the menace of war* must furnish England all assistance and facilities within its power. It makes a definite change in entrusting the protection of foreigners in Egypt to Egypt; and it appears to restore the Sudan to its legal status as before the British ultimatum of November 22, 1924. These are real concessions by the British, but they are far from what the Nationalist Party has long demanded; and the Egyptian premier who signed them is a puppet representing a party which has never been able to control more than a third of the Egyptian Parliament. Hitherto he has been maintained in power by the very British troops which dissolved the Parliament. It remains to be seen whether with these concessions, and with control of the governmental machinery, he can elect a parliament which will ratify the agreement.

WHILE THE NEGOTIATIONS for the settlement of the Russo-Chinese quarrel over the Chinese Eastern Railway were deadlocked at Manchuli, Moscow was thrown into an anti-imperialist frenzy by a report from the Tass (Russian) news agency that Secretary Stimson had made "a confidential proposal to Britain, France, Japan, Germany, and Italy that they, with the United States, should institute a six-power control over the railroad and nominate a foreign manager with full authority, who should be a national of a country not directly interested in the railroad." Later dispatches declared that all the Powers ignored or repudiated the suggestion. Whatever may be the truth of the report, there is no prospect of such a project

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being carried through. We have learned by past experience that the intervention of Western Powers is not welcomed in Manchuria, even if it is designed to prevent a war. Philander C. Knox proposed in 1909 that international bankers should advance the money to China for redeeming the Manchurian railways, but Russia and Japan blocked the plan, and they are likely to block any similar plan in the future. Japan insists upon maintaining her dominant economic position in Manchuria, and Russia refuses to trust her interests to any coalition of Powers that are hostile to her fundamental purposes. Since there is no international body impartial enough to satisfy both China and Russia, the hope of peace seems to rest entirely in the good sense and reasonableness of the negotiators of these two nations.

ACTING ON THE ADVICE of a majority of his committee, Senator Smoot has withdrawn his plan for a sliding scale of sugar duties, whereby the duty would increase as the world price of refined sugar fell. The storm of protests stirred up by the increase of sugar rates in the House bill gave the Utah Senator a good chance to put forward his scheme, which was designed, we were told, to stabilize the price of sugar (needless to say, at a high point). Both theory and experience indicate clearly enough that the prices of agricultural products cannot be stabilized by any such device, but that made no difference. The producers who were to be benefited by the plan would have none of it, however, so it was sorrowfully abandoned, and Senator Smoot appeared once more in his familiar role of advocate of flat duties on sugar, though up to the time of going to press he had not stated what they were to be. Nobody, in Congress or out of it, is giving much attention, apparently, to the really important question, namely, is it worth while to shove up the price of sugar and thus encourage the development here of an uneconomical beet industry to the point where it will supply most of our consumption at high prices, or do we prefer to take advantage of the warm sunshine of the tropics and have cheap sugar? One might think that those arch opponents of sweets, the cigarette manufacturers, were directing our sugar-tariff policy.

VIRGINIA, the mother of Presidents and sugar-cured ham, will achieve another distinction next November in holding an election for governor which will be an actual contest. Heretofore the Democratic primary has been the real election and the voting in November a mere ratification. But the fight of Bishop Cannon of the Methodist Episcopal Church South against Al Smith and Raskobism in the Democratic Party has upset the old tradition. Bishop Cannon some time ago induced the anti-Raskob Democrats and the Republicans to nominate a single candidate for governor in William Moseley Brown, professor of education and psychology at Washington and Lee University. The regular Democrats have now nominated John Garland Pollard, dean of the school of government and citizenship at William and Mary College. Had the primary vote reached 175,000, the figure four years ago, the election in November would have been conceded to Mr. Pollard, but only about 150,000 ballots were cast, which in the opinion of the experts means a real fight at the polls next autumn. "Who's Who" says that Mr. Brown is a Democrat, a Presbyterian, and a Mason, while his opponent is a Democrat, a Baptist, and a Mason. It might have added that they are both Drys. So whatever happens the next governor of the Old Dominion will be a Democrat, a Protestant, a Mason, a Dry, and a college professor—which is a good deal. And doubtless Virginia will continue to supply us with sugar-cured ham—which is more.

SIGNS CONTINUE TO MULTIPLY that the South is at last awake to the social disgrace of labor conditions in its cotton mills. All the chief mill owners of Gaston County, North Carolina, made famous by the Communist-led strike, have recently reduced their hours from sixty to fifty-five a week without a proportionate reduction in wages. The eleven-hour day will continue in the mills, but workers will have two days of rest each week. This is an indirect victory for the strikers, who, even in defeat, advertised their grievances so well that public opinion brought pressure upon the mill owners. That new public opinion was evident at the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia, where Southern speakers led the attack upon Southern labor standards. Bruce Crawford, editor of *Crawford's Weekly* of Norton, Virginia, declared:

> The Elizabethton disorders revealed that the paramount issue in the South is recognition of the right to organize. The mill owners will grant appreciable wage increases and make certain improvements in working conditions, but they stubbornly refuse to recognize labor unions. In a day when everybody from the manufacturer to the bootlegger belongs to an organization, how gullible the workers would be to repudiate their leaders, the detested organizers, and undertake to fight their battles alone!

WE NOTE WITH PLEASURE the presidential address delivered on July 31 by Sir Thomas Holland, rector of the Imperial College of Science in London, before the British Association for the Advancement of Science in session at Johannesburg, South Africa. Sir Thomas calls attention to the striking fact that the British Empire and the United States between them produce more than two-thirds of the minerals annually consumed by the world, and goes on to suggest an agreement between these two countries not to export mineral products to any nation violating the Kellogg pact. Under these conditions, he suggests, no war could last long. It is not the proposed extension of the Capper resolution, interesting and suggestive though it is, that we wish to commend, but the attitude of responsibility toward public affairs disclosed in Sir Thomas's suggestion. Natural scientists in recent years have been too prone to assume that they have no particular concern as to what is done with their discoveries. Our chemists, for example, devise more and more deadly poison gases and turn them over to governments, apparently with a clear conscience. The scientist as pure scientist perhaps is not concerned with the application of his findings, but the scientist, like the rest of us, is a citizen and a member of the state, and he has no more business than anyone else to help his state do wrong or to shirk responsibility for helping it do right. Natural scientists have more than once gone sadly astray in their excursions into economics and politics, but it is a wholesome sign when they accept their full responsibility and do not attempt to shirk their duty as citizens by pleading their immunity as scientists.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CENTURY AGO the first steam locomotive to be put into actual service in this country went puffing and snorting out of Honesdale, Pennsylvania, over the sixteen-mile railway of the Delaware and Hudson Canal Company to Carbondale. It was the Stourbridge Lion, imported from England. The steam locomotive has been the greatest single factor in the industrial evolution of the United States, and it has been more important to us than to any other nation in history. It arrived just at the moment when we had subdued the Atlantic seaboard and were looking for means to press westward over a stretch of 3,000 miles traversed by only one east and west river of any consequence—the Ohio. Yet progress has been so amazingly swift in transportation that three new kinds—of major importance—have come to us since the steam locomotive: the electric car, the gasoline automobile, and the airplane. And the centenary of our first steam locomotive finds us occupied not with it but with the fact that every family in the United States—statistically regarded—has an automobile and is hoping one day to have an airplane. Yet the railroad is far from demoded. Beside it the airplane is still only groping after passenger traffic and makes no pretense of handling freight. The motor bus, the privately-owned automobile, and the truck have cut deeply into the short-haul passenger business, and to a lesser degree into freight traffic, but for long distances and large shipments the railroad seems likely to hold its own for an indefinite time. Not so much can be said for the steam locomotive. Electrification of our railroads is one of the strong probabilities of the power age which we are entering. The second centenary of the steam locomotive may find it only in museums.

TRAGEDY AT SEA comes in many ways, but the way which is the most awful (in the word's original sense of inspiring awe), and at the same time the most agonizing to those who have loved ones on board, is that which receives the least attention in the press and therefore makes the smallest ripple on the surface of the world's emotions. We are thinking of the ship which simply disappears. The newspapers write nothing of her because there is nothing to write. There is no fire, no wreck, no collision to chronicle. The ship leaves port, is spoken once or twice, perhaps, and then . . . After a while she is reported as overdue and friends of those aboard become anxious. Then anxiety turns to fear, and finally to despair. There is little or no newspaper comment because there is no crisis, no event to record. A day comes finally when the ship is posted as missing, but long before that, hope has faded and even memory has begun to blur. Who in this country, for instance, knows that the Danish training ship Köbenhavn, the world's largest sailing vessel, cleared from Buenos Aires last December, was spoken a week later, and then disappeared from human ken with her company of sixty-seven men and boys. Had we had news of the loss in some definite way it would have gone on the first pages of the newspapers all over the world. As it was, the tragedy just slipped by unnoticed. The last news we saw was an inconspicuous dispatch on June 26 saying that a searching vessel had visited the island of Tristan da Cunha, had shown the inhabitants photographs of the Köbenhavn, and had been told that the ship had been seen drifting by, deep in the water and apparently abandoned. Probably there will never be anything else to tell.

HERE IS SOMETHING NEW in sales resistance. In looking over the August issue of the magazine *Chile,* which has just come to our desk, we chance upon the following significant information:

> The Government of Chile is not looking with favor on proposals of American companies to introduce the use of chewing gum on a wide scale into Chile. The Government's views have found support in the press, which recently has published articles attacking the chewing-gum vice. It is also known that higher duties on the article are contemplated to offset any efforts of manufacturers to popularize the use of gum through advertising campaigns. In the opinion of Chileans not every American custom is a desirable one to imitate, and Chileans prefer to continue a moderate indulgence in their famous wines and abstain from chewing gum than to become dry and chew gum.

In the name of an imperiled chewing-gum industry, what does all this mean? We have already sent the Federal Trade Commission a complaint against the Chilean Government, asking the issuance of a "cease and desist" order. If this move is unsuccessful, we shall next apply to the Prohibition Unit for a padlock order. It is not merely the business aspects of this affair, however, bad as they are, that exercise us, but the lack of Pan-American cultural unity. "In the opinion of Chileans, not every American custom is a desirable one to imitate." And pray why not? Time will bring them to reason, however. They are dealing with a $60,000,000 industry which without thought of selfish gain has already set every American jaw in motion. It now seeks to extend its service even to the remotest lands, and we would remind recalcitrant Chileans that Holy Writ itself predicts the trade's ultimate triumph; for in the outer darkness where the stiff-necked will finally reside "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

VICTOR L. BERGER, dead at the age of sixty-nine in consequence of injuries sustained when a street car ran into him several weeks ago, was an eminently useful and high-minded citizen whose loss *The Nation* keenly regrets. He was so integral a part of the German-American Socialist movement centering in Milwaukee that it is difficult to conceive of it apart from him. Born in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, he came to this country at the age of eighteen and earned his living in a variety of ways until 1892, when he became the editor of a German-language weekly in Milwaukee. In 1911 he started the Milwaukee *Leader* as a daily, and continued as its editor up to the time of his death. It is the only Socialist and labor daily newspaper now printed in English in the United States. Mr. Berger was elected to the House of Representatives in 1910—the first Socialist to go to Washington. He was re-elected in 1918, but before he could take his seat he was convicted under the espionage law for opposing the war, and when the House met in the autumn of 1919 he was ousted. In 1921 the United States Supreme Court reversed the verdict against him, so he never actually went to jail. Mr. Berger will be remembered rather as an able expounder and defender of accepted Socialist doctrine than as a creator of it. He was a good-natured and humorous fighter, but uncompromising in his principles when a serious issue was at stake. He will be missed among those who are working for a better America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Decline of Massachusetts

WHAT has happened to Massachusetts since the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti on August 23, 1927? Has retribution been visited upon the State more swiftly and surely than any one would have predicted? Is the fear of the last two years, the mental and moral bankruptcy of her leadership, the result of the shocking injustice which she perpetrated in the face of enlightened world opinion? Or was it the previous existence of this decay that made the tragedy possible?

As usual it is difficult to disentangle cause and effect. No doubt there is a mixture, and while we may not be able to separate it we can take note of it. For it is a striking phenomenon. Since 1927, at least, observers cannot have failed to notice the flabby mental and moral fiber of a State which was once the great source of much that was most vital in American thought and action. Massachusetts, there she stands! Stands for what? Once she stood for liberty, enlightenment, humanity. Today—obsessed with timidity, incapacity, and obscurantism—she stands for a censorship of books and plays which has made her a joke in the rest of the United States; for restrictions upon freedom of speech and assemblage which would have turned the Minute Men against her; for opposition to progressive movements within her borders while at the same time she complains of the palsy that has attacked her industrial life.

Whatever may have been the decadence of Massachusetts in 1927, it had not been much observed or commented upon. If the State has not been in the process of spectacular deterioration in the last two years, it has at least acted so as to reveal its weakness to the world in an unprecedentedly open and rapid fashion. In an article elsewhere in this issue Waldo L. Cook relates some of the fumbling and fatuous attempts within the space of a year to seal up and cause to be forgotten the tragedy of Sacco and Vanzetti. It was part of a deliberate campaign decreed immediately after the executions. At that time the Boston *Herald* wrote editorially:

> The chapter is closed. The die is cast. The arrow has flown. Now let us go forward to the duties and responsibilities of the common day with a renewed determination to maintain our present system of government and our existing social order.

In other words the attitude of Massachusetts was that right or wrong she would not reexamine or repent. She adopted the policy of the Closed Mind. And having closed her mind in one direction she began naturally to close it in others, denying herself the vitalizing aid of progressive ideas of other sorts. It is not merely of Sacco and Vanzetti that Massachusetts has refused to hear in the last two years. The ridiculous Watch and Ward Society of Boston has returned to activity after a long period of comparative quiet, and the list of books which it has been able to ban from public sale has been a cause of wonder and mirth in more civilized parts of the globe. A praiseworthy effort was made in the Massachusetts legislature last winter by a group of intelligent editors and other persons to change the law whereby a book may be barred as obscene because of a single word apart from its context. The effort failed. The absurd law still stands which makes it impossible to plead the general tone or purpose of a book in its behalf—the statute which brought about the suppression of so important a work as Theodore Dreiser's "An American Tragedy."

We told last year something of the difficulties of the committee in Boston which set out to get a hall for a Sacco-Vanzetti memorial meeting. The owners of halls generally were unwilling or afraid to hire their facilities to the committee, but after many fruitless efforts Mr. Furash finally opened his Scenic Auditorium for the meeting, and it was held without interference, although later there was a threat —never put into effect—to prosecute Professor Horace M. Kallen for blasphemy because of certain of his remarks. This year the committee again engaged the Scenic Auditorium, but it was so damaged by fire recently as to make a change of plan necessary. The committee has applied to all the halls, theaters, and hotels in Boston, capable of seating 1,000 persons—more than thirty-five in all—and its applications have either been denied or ignored. Faneuil Hall and the Old South Meeting House—the latter supposedly a sanctuary of free speech—have both been refused. Advertisements have been placed—after difficulties in obtaining their insertion—in several Boston newspapers, all without result. The committee has decided, therefore, to shift the meeting to New York City, and it will take place at the Town Hall at 8.30 p. m. on August 23. We urge our readers to give the meeting their fullest support.

William Sloane Kennedy, a stalwart Massachusetts liberal and the author of a long shelf of books, who was drowned on August 4 when in his seventy-ninth year, wrote an article for the *Lantern* just before his death from which we quote the following:

> The legal murder of these poor gentle-souled Italians, against whom all kinds of trumpery and ridiculous evidence was admitted to court, was like an earthquake leaving a deep zig-zag crevice running through society. On which side of the new line do you now belong? That is the important question for every soul in the world. I shouldn't wonder if this lurid beacon fire, this auto-da-fè on Beacon Hill, should be the rallying banner, the pistol shots of Boston policemen the detonator to initiate eventually a world-wide revolution. These poor trembling cowards of tyrannical Brahmins, the broadcloth mobs, may find they have set the world afire; in their folly thrown their match into an infinite mass of inflammable material.

Massachusetts as yet shows no realization of the crime she has committed against humanity. But retribution is at work nevertheless. Massachusetts is not what she once was. Her greatness is on the decline, but her only defensive action so far is to stop up her eyes, ears, and mind against her fate. It is a pitiable spectacle, but we can see only one way to escape further decadence and disaster. If there is still enough intelligent leadership in the State to count, it must attack the cowardly and hopeless policy of the Closed Mind. Massachusetts must again begin to listen to truth—even when it hurts. That is the only way to check her decline and to prevent the necessity of chronicling some day her fall.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Baby Motor Cars

THE announcement in the New York *Times* of the invention of a new baby motor car that will retail for $200 has aroused much interest and some horror. Into the troubled sleep of traffic officers such an invention will bring nightmares reminiscent of the plague of locusts; and city planners who have dreamed of ridding our streets of congestion during this generation will throw up their hands in despair. But if the car fulfills its introductory promises, America will buy it and let the consequences take care of themselves.

Psychologically the coming of a $200 motor car to the American market may be a good thing for us; it may be a healthful antidote to our expensive habits of emulation. As a people we have been oversold on costly cars in recent years until the automobile has become as much a means of economic display as a vehicle to transport human beings. In fact, conventional attitudes toward the automobile have gone through a complete cycle until in a sense we are back where we started from in the early years of this century. In those days, when the first cars were being marketed, common folks leaned out their front windows and stared with undisguised envy at the socially elite as they chugged by in high horseless carriages, dusters, and goggles. For a long time it was distinctly dangerous for any politician who sought labor votes to own a limousine. Then, when motor cars became relatively cheap, snobbishness and conspicuous waste declined, and for a time it was entirely honorable to own a Ford.

But the automobile ad writers were not content. They made raids upon our vanity and told us how desirable it was to keep up with the Joneses. "Own a car worthy of yourself and your position in life," ran the legend. The vaudeville wise-crack, "That isn't a car, that's a Ford," did its deadly work by a million repetitions. When Henry Ford changed his old model he surrendered to the new urge toward luxury by making better cars for more money instead of equally good cars for less money. Now we have reached the point where literally millions of Americans scorn all the cheap models and buy "real cars" on the instalment plan when they have no financial reserve for sickness and old age, and often no funds for good books, good music, and vacations.

Perhaps a $200 car will bring us back to saner standards of expenditure. The new baby car, which is the invention of James V. Martin, has several features which may revolutionize automobile manufacture and eventually force down the price of larger cars. It has no chassis and no chassis frame. Each wheel is suspended separately in such a way that it can absorb the shock of rough jolting without affecting the other wheels. With a wheelbase only slightly longer than half that of the smallest Ford, this car, if present plans are carried through, can be shipped from mail-order houses to customers in a packing case, and housed permanently in the case as a garage. Any burly male can lift a corner of it and insert the jack. Its capacity to travel fifty miles an hour over rough roads without discomfort to the passengers is vouched for by the automobile editor of the New York *Times*.

Whatever may be the effect upon the American market of the perfection of such an automobile, there can be no doubt that the advent of the tiny underslung car is long overdue in this country. American travellers in Europe have noted the awkwardness of the high-built American machines when compared with the graceful, beetle-like cars which run about the British and Continental countryside. The essential reason for the difference in design no longer exists. The height of our cars was originally determined by the depth of mud-holes in Arkansas and the size of obstructing boulders in Arizona, but with the advent of a network of hard-surfaced roads such hazards are now so rare that designers can well afford to ignore them. Already, in fact, a tiny British car, the Austin, with a wheelbase considerably smaller than the smallest Ford, is scheduled to invade the American market.

In the present stage of traffic development cheap motor cars are much more important for Europe, South America, and the Orient than for the United States. Americans can and will continue to buy high-priced automobiles, but in most foreign nations the level of income will not permit the common citizens to buy even our cheapest models. A Chinese farmer could scarcely buy a Ford roadster with the cash income of a lifetime. Russia has only one automobile to every 6,980 people; Great Britain's ratio is one to thirty-two, and ours is one to five. The difference is largely due to differences in wealth. A $200 motor car, by touching the common man's pocketbook, may bring to foreign countries that revolution in road building and community living for which the Model-T Ford was largely responsible in this country. If this revolution comes to foreign countries, it is to be hoped that they will teach us how to keep motorists from living together in big cities and all going downtown at the rush hour by the same route.

The Muzzle in China

THE treaty-port press of the Far East is a phenomenon unique in the history of journalism, and the foreign correspondents in China today occupy a position utterly unlike that of their colleagues in Western Europe. These newspapers and these correspondents are not subject to the ordinary domestic laws of China. Because the outworn system of extraterritoriality persists, they are subject only to the laws of foreign countries. Indeed, many Chinese newspapers have in the past taken advantage of this anachronism, reorganized themselves under dummy foreign corporations, and in political crises have claimed the foreign protection accorded to foreign business. That system was so flagrantly unjust that it no longer works, but the vice of extraterritoriality persists. Up and down the coast of Asia these citadels of foreign pride continue to flout native sensibilities.

The *North China Daily News*, for instance, the leading British newspaper in China, is published on the Bund in the International Settlement of Shanghai. Its editor is a cultured Englishman who lived twenty years in China before he began to cultivate social relations even with the most distinguished members of what he regarded as a decadent and inferior race. On the day after the Shanghai shootings

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of May 30, 1925, he had the audacity to demand—from the Chinese, who had been shot down by British police!—"Unconditional Surrender." He belittled the Nationalist movement as long as possible, and called for British troops to invade China to stop it when it became formidable. It is utterly inconceivable that the Paris editions of the New York *Herald,* the Chicago *Tribune,* or the London *Daily Mail* should criticize the French Government with such persistence or acidity, and it is doubtful whether a foreign-language newspaper in America which printed such criticism would be permitted to pass through the mails.

Recently the Chinese Government ordered the Post Office to refuse to accept copies of the *North China Daily News* and of its weekly edition, the *North China Herald,* and instructed the customs service to prevent copies from leaving Shanghai on ships of all nationalities. The *North China,* thereupon, set up a loud shout for the freedom of the press and circulated throughout the world what it called "An Account of the Endeavors of Nanking to Suppress the Truth About Affairs in China." In the end, apparently, it promised to be good and was restored to the mails.

The Peking *Leader,* an American-owned and edited paper, is in a somewhat different position. Its editor, Grover Clark, has aspired to be a sort of foreign conscience for China. He has sympathized, in general, with the Nationalist movement; he has at times trenchantly criticized his own Government; he has also criticized the Nationalists. For that, apparently, he is to be punished. It is reported that a censor has been planted in the *Leader's* office. That seems to us silly; but we cannot share the passionate indignation of those who feel it a peculiar insult to subject an American newspaper in China to a measure of the rigid control exercised over all its Chinese colleagues.

The Chinese Government has attacked along another line, asking the American Minister to deport four American newspapermen whom it regards as persistently and unfairly unfriendly. One of these is Hallett Abend of the New York *Times,* whose acumen in analyzing Chinese politics has been blunted by a pathological hate of the Nationalists which has repeatedly led him into mistaken dismal prophecies. Another is Charles Dailey of the Chicago *Tribune;* a third is Rodney Gilbert, dispenser of gloom to various British papers. These three men all write from Peking; and it is difficult for any newspaperman, visiting daily the legations in the lovely abandoned capital, to have anything but a distorted and jaundiced view of China. The fourth of the "unfriendly" correspondents, the versatile George Sokolsky, is a familiar figure in Shanghai, editor of the *Far Eastern Review*—which in its advertising and in its editorial columns seems to reflect Japanese rather than Chinese interests—and author of vitriolically illuminating articles in the *North China* upon the Chinese politics in which he dabbles.

None of these men, of course, was or will be deported. The American minister, much as he may sometimes have wished to do so, has no power to order Americans out of China. And the Chinese Government, under the extraterritorial laws, is also powerless to deport them, or even to punish them should they openly violate China's laws. Italy, Spain, France, Russia, Mexico, and Rumania can deport, and in recent years have deported, American newspapermen. In China alone foreign newspapers and newspapermen retain a privileged status, superior to the Chinese themselves.

Enter Cupid

LOVE, we hear, can conquer even a Japanese *nako-odo*—love and a flood of Hollywood motion pictures. Once the *nako-odo* was the most dignified functionary of the Japanese marriage system, the man who brought together the family with a surplus maiden and the family with a surplus male and ultimately sealed the bargain. Now he is suffering from technological unemployment. Who wants a *nako-odo* when he (she) can do the job himself (herself)?

The decay of the *nako-odo* has been gradual. In the orthodox book of Japanese marriage it was written: "In choosing your *nako-odo* you must be as careful as you are in choosing your wife or husband; he must be a person of respected social standing whom you may treat all your life as your counsellor, guide, superior, and friend." That is what the book said. In real life the picture was a trifle more shabby; the taint of high-pressure salesmanship crept in. A correspondent who writes under the name of Santoro in the Tokyo *Trans-Pacific* describes the decline of the *nako-odo* as follows:

> There are many things in life of which we should beware; the hands of a pickpocket, the horns of a bull, the hind legs of a horse, the eyes of a widow, the promises of a statesman, and many others. Not the least ticklish thing about them is the lying tongue of the *nako-odo,* or the match-maker in marriage. The office of the *nako-odo,* once held in great respect, is somewhat at a discount in these days of increasing love marriages. Time was once when marriage without *nako-odo* was regarded as disreputable as fornication, and when it was thought that every person, to be a full-fledged respectable unit of the nation, must perform the office of *nako-odo* at least three times in his life.

Sometimes the work of the *nako-odo* was arduous. Proverbially, says Mr. Santoro, he wears out a thousand sandals "walking to and fro between the homes of the bride-to-be and the groom-to-be, telling ten thousand little lies to make the two parties glad of the coming event." And then, if they are not glad of the event and the marriage ends in disaster, the poor, harassed *nako-odo* is dragged into the family quarrel as arbiter, and in case of failure reproached as villain. Occasionally through *shinju* (double suicide) a young couple repudiate the marriage-maker so directly as to bring lasting shame upon him.

Now the waves of our aphrodisiacal culture have beaten upon Japan for a generation. Clara Bow and Greta Garbo have illustrated what the Western missionaries have ceremonially sanctified; sex attraction is out in the open and marriage by personal choice is known to be the established system in the most "advanced" nations of the earth. Perhaps, says the younger generation of Japan, this thing called love isn't all mutual hypnotism; perhaps it is as sound a basis of satisfactory marriage as the studied wisdom of the family.

So Japan is in for an era when she will sample love as a social value. In the dim distance one can see the Japo-Victorians, the Nagasaki Cabells, and the Tokyo Neo-Freudians. Can it be that the Japanese in the days of their troubled liberty will look back longingly to the golden era of the *nako-odo?*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It Seems to Heywood Broun

MABEL WALKER WILLEBRANDT has contributed some interesting factual information upon the subject of prohibition, but when she ventures into surmise and interpretation her findings seem to me less sound. For instance, Mrs. Willebrandt has picked up one favorite belief of the reformers without stopping to weigh its validity. I refer to her assertion in a recent article that most violators of the Volstead Act are inspired largely by a desire to show off. This we have heard before. It is a favorite cry of the crusaders against the cigarette and more particularly of those propagandists who would discourage women smokers. Again and again the country has been assured that women puffed and blew rings for no reason save a desire to attract attention to themselves.

By now this argument should have lost all force. Surely it is no longer news if a woman smokes a cigarette. In the New York community, at any rate, such a performance has completely lost all shock value. I am willing to waive the question of whether the habit is good or bad. My insistence at the moment centers merely upon the assertion that by now woman has definitely proved that she smokes from precisely the same impulse which animates the male—she happens to like it.

It must be that reformers grow restive under the accusation that they are prone to fly at all things which are pleasant. They meet that charge by insisting that the joys supposedly associated with the minor vices are wholly spurious. Here, for instance, is Mrs. Willebrandt trying to convince me and others that the friendly cocktail is merely a device for the propagation of exhibitionism.

People who see the drink habit so insecurely rooted live, I believe, in a fool's paradise. Perhaps there was some extra added kick once upon a time in the fact that the stuff was contraband. I will not deny that I thrilled eight or ten years ago at such times as I stood before some fast-barred door and knocked to say, "It's all right, let me in, I'm a friend of Bob Beasley's." Possibly each drinker, then, did have a sense of being devilish and daring. But, Lord bless you, Mabel, that psychology went out these many years ago. Illicit drinking is by now more than ten years old. Such of us as have known prohibition man and boy for a decade cannot be expected to feel romantic about things which have become so utterly familiar.

Nor do I believe at all that cocktails are merely a fashion established by the idle rich. There is hardly a home in all the land so humble that it will not afford synthetic gin when guests arrive. From the dry point of view the tragic thing about prohibition enforcement is not so much the fact that an articulate minority is in revolt against the law as that very many millions have managed to forget that it exists at all. It is my guess that America is politically dry. The Anti-Saloon Leaguers are probably correct in declaring that no wet can be elected president of the United States. One takes a risk in making this prediction for all time but it seems a good bet for the immediate future at least. But many false generalizations can be reared upon this apparent condition. Mr. Hoover's vast majorities cannot justly be attributed to the sincere and sweeping desire of the American public for a bone-dry nation. Al Smith was in a most unfortunate position. He could hardly lead a political revolution against aridity since no such thing existed. Millions of voters calmly endorsed the advocate of the experiment noble in purpose because they had complete confidence that nothing which Mr. Hoover had to say about liquor would have any actual effect upon prevalent conditions. Indeed, the attitude of wet Republicans was not wholly without logic and even sportsmanship. It seemed to them that there was no particular point in kicking a law when it was down.

It is foolish to call the Volstead Act oppressive when it touches the lives of most of us with such exceeding dimness. The man who sits in a comfortable speakeasy and slowly drinks his Tom Collins can hardly be expected to rush out and man a barricade in the cause of personal liberty. It is naturally difficult to convince him that he has lost any inalienable right. To be sure, gin costs more than in the days before the country went dry. Mr. Wickersham's Commission can save itself a great deal of time and trouble by taking the current price of this liquor as an index of the efficiency of enforcement. In communities where gin is high it is fair to admit that the agents are actually on the job. When the price falls prohibition is not working. As the result of some self-sacrificing researches of my own I am prepared to state that post-prohibition gin costs just a shade more than double the pre-Volsteadian beverage. This is not a very important rise in a country where the standard of living is constantly on the upgrade. Wages have practically kept pace with gin, so the suffering is not acute.

Of course, the quality of the fluid has fallen off, but it is nonsense to assume that nothing but the finest was served in the days before the government stepped in to poison the wells. There is not much to choose between the cocktail of today and that which our fathers knew. Beer, however, is in rather a bad way. To this extent Volstead and his followers have succeeded almost up to their hopes. Indeed, the act might well have been labeled, "A bill to discourage the drinking of good beer in favor of indifferent gin."

Nevertheless, I quite agree with the boast of the prohibitionists that the country is better off. The saloon was generally a dull and humdrum place. And its facilities for coeducation were limited. The modern speakeasy is brighter, gayer, and far more stimulating. Who, I should like to know, wants to put his foot on a brass rail when it is his present privilege to sit in a wide chair before a spotless table? Mrs. Willebrandt lacks sufficient personal contacts. A well-wisher would much enjoy escorting her to some of the better places in New York. If she still insists at the end of such a tour that all the smiling people round about are only trying to be smart I will agree to eat the entire edition of the newspaper in which her article appeared. That is if I may be permitted to remove the comic section.

HEYWOOD BROUN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Forgetting Sacco and Vanzetti

By WALDO L. COOK

THE desire to forget Sacco and Vanzetti, after their execution two years ago this month, gripped Massachusetts. The men were dead. Nothing that could be spoken or written or done would make them live again, even if, as a minority firmly believed, they had been victims of an appalling misadventure in our criminal courts.

But events have not permitted us to forget.

* * * * *

The extreme sensitiveness of the Boston authorities concerning the "good shoemaker and poor fish peddler" has been betrayed more than once within a year. In view of the general desire to forget, it was surprising to read one August morning a year ago that the police had initiated a prosecution of Dr. Horace M. Kallen of New York City for blasphemy, or some such crime, in his address the previous evening at the Sacco-Vanzetti memorial meeting. That gentle philosopher, who would gladly have faced his accusers, was quickly absolved at police headquarters, and the prosecution was dropped. Yet Police Superintendent Crowley's literary censorship of the Boston book and magazine trade has seldom served us with a more appetizing sensation.

* * * * *

When autumn had followed summer, the literary consequences of the deaths of Sacco and Vanzetti were more than ever in evidence.[1] Nothing could prevent the authorities from taking action calculated to bring some of these works to the attention of the Massachusetts public. When a copy of the "Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti" was unexpectedly presented without ceremony to Governor Fuller in front of the State House, immediately after the inauguration of his successor in office, he angrily threw the volume to the sidewalk; and none of us could help reading about so dramatic an incident in the newspapers. Upton Sinclair must have suffered the keenest disappointment of his life in the failure of Superintendent Crowley to ban the sale of his novel. For already "Gods of the Lightning," which ran for weeks at the Little Theatre in New York, without being stopped or even noticed by the New York authorities, had been condemned by the corporation counsel as unfit for presentation on any Boston stage.. Why this discrimination?

In view of the special sensitiveness of South Boston as well as Back Bay Boston, of the Boston of Mr. Curley and Mr. Fitzgerald as well as the Boston of the Harvard and Union clubs, of Suffolk county as well as Norfolk county, to the least provocation in this matter, Mr. Deland's condemnation would have had some justification in the danger of rioting on account of the play's volcanic emotional appeal. "Gods" gives no standing room to a coldly detached neutrality. But the reasons advanced and elaborated by the corporation counsel were mere pretexts for the play's suppression. Boston, unlike New York, was not equal to the strain of the play's presentation, and liberty was sacrificed.

So we have been forgetting Sacco and Vanzetti by having "Gods" barred from our State capital while Mr. Sinclair's novel, an onslaught on the Commonwealth no less savage, if not so wild, and surely much more direct, can be freely bought at our bookstores and taken for a cent a day from at least some of our public libraries.

* * * * *

Harry J. Canter of East Boston was the candidate of the Workers' Party for secretary of state. On November 3, 1928, just before the elections, the Boston branch of the party staged a street demonstration. Canter himself carried a conspicuous placard bearing the defiant words: "FULLER —MURDERER OF SACCO AND VANZETTI." Twenty-four paraders walked back and forth several times in front of the State House after a policeman had ordered them to "beat it," whereupon they were arrested for sauntering and loitering. Six weeks later the twenty-four were fined $20 each for that violation of the statutes.

But Canter was held on the charge of criminal libel for carrying the placard. It was not a civil prosecution for damages brought by the man libeled. The Commonwealth was the accuser on the assumption that Canter was not exercising legitimate political rights but was focussing his activities on the commission of a crime. The Canter trial came in May of this year before a Boston jury. He was convicted and sentenced to serve one year in jail.

It was impossible to feel any rush of sympathy for Canter. Sympathy for persons who abuse others, even in politics, has never seemed to be required according to a reasonable interpretation of the principle of free speech. To placard Governer Fuller as a murderer was excessive abuse. Yet why the police arrested these paraders was a puzzle, if our Massachusetts people were ever to forget the Sacco-Vanzetti case.

It became necessary to follow Canter's fortunes for six solid months. We read in the papers early in November about the arrest of the paraders. In December we read about the fining of them $20 each. At intervals we were reminded of the coming Canter trial by the postponements of it until Governor Fuller's return from Europe. In May, finally, we read the headlines and the reports of the jury trial, covering a period of at least three days; while, at the very end in imposing punishment, the Boston judge delivered a speech. For that six months of public advertising of Sacco and Vanzetti we could thank the Boston police and the district attorney of Suffolk county.

Canter's attorneys at the trial were unable, under the court's ruling, to introduce the record of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Thereupon, the defense was concentrated upon the contention that he did not mean literally that

[1] "America Arraigned," an anthology of 61 poems, edited by Ralph Cheyney and Lucia Trent.
"Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti," edited by Marion Denman Frankfurter and Gardner Jackson.
"Thirteen Days," by Jeannette Marks, an account of the last days of Sacco and Vanzetti.
"Gods of the Lightning," a play by Maxwell Anderson and Harold Hickerson.
"Boston," a two-volume novel by Upton Sinclair.
A section in Edna St. Vincent Millay's "Buck in the Snow."
Several poems in Kathleen Millay's "Hermit Thrush."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor Fuller was a murderer. He had meant simply that the Governor was "morally responsible" for the executions. In a sense, the Governor was responsible, but the executive council shared the responsibility; for together the Governor and council could have prevented the execution by commuting the death sentences to life imprisonment. But the court would make no allowances in Canter's case for political license in campaigning for a radical party.

Are we to have in Massachusetts a severer curb on political violence because Canter is in jail? It is too much to expect. There will be no general softening of epithets, in Boston at least, because of this episode.

* * * * *

As the months passed in this second year since the executions, the effort to forget was again and again frustrated. When "Gods" was making its New York audience cry "Shame," the *Outlook* magazine published a paid-for confession by Frank Silva that he was one of the bandit gang who staged the unsuccessful Bridgewater holdup on December 24, 1919, for which Vanzetti was tried and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. Silva's story exonerated Vanzetti of the least participation in that vicious crime. Massachusetts was not impressed by the *Outlook* articles—"impressed" being the word used in official circles at the State House. As for the public that had accepted without reservations the report of the Lowell committee, it seemed almost sacrilegious to heed the confession of a bandit as against the assurances of Vanzetti's guilt from the Lowell committee. Still there were some who could not help observing that even a crook might for once tell the truth, but that a searching check-up of his story for purposes of independent verification was essential before it could be accepted in whole or in part.

Out of the Silva confession came a little complication to keep one's interest alive. Silva had said that one of the Bridgewater bandits was Joseph San Marco, now a "lifer" at the State prison in Charlestown. San Marco denied Silva's accusation in a letter, signed by himself, sent to the State commissioner of correction and then forwarded to Governor Fuller. To support his denial of participation in the Bridgewater holdup, San Marco declared that on the day of the holdup he was working "up to 12 o'clock noon for one of the largest firms in Boston, whose books will show this to be true." But the name of that firm was not given in the letter.

Silva was a liar if San Marco told the truth. If one were interested in establishing the truth beyond dispute, the next step was to learn the name of San Marco's employer and test the claim that San Marco had worked up to 12 o'clock noon on December 24, 1919. But no one in authority moved; no one in authority was interested. So far as this Commonwealth is officially concerned, there is no longer a Sacco-Vanzetti case.

It was eventually learned that San Marco claimed to have worked on December 24, 1919, for a Boston concern that, unfortunately for this story, went out of business some time ago, and, in going out of business, destroyed all its books, payrolls, and shop records. Under these circumstances, it would be rash to say that a convincing test of San Marco's denial of Silva's confession would ever be possible. Yet this mystery has a place in the year's record.

* * * * *

In the spring came Henry Holt and Company's publication of the official transcript of the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti and the subsequent proceedings.* This massive publication of 6,000 pages contained some important new material concerning President Lowell's undercover treatment of Bosco and Guadagni, alibi witnesses for Sacco. It soon developed that President Lowell had been stirred out of his ordinary reticence and calm. Efforts to forget Sacco and Vanzetti were again neutralized about May Day by the letter which the head of Harvard wrote to Mr. Cohen, a student and the editor of the *Harvard Progressive,* published fortnightly by the Harvard Socialist Club.

Mr. Cohen had printed severely critical articles on President Lowell's handling of the Bosco and Guadagni affair, and had invited the president to reply in the columns of the *Harvard Progressive.* It was a notable journalistic achievement for Mr. Cohen to elicit a letter containing Mr. Lowell's first public expression on the celebrated case since the executions. Especially challenging, one might say revealing, is the last word in the second sentence (the remainder of the letter being irrelevant): "Dear Mr. Cohen: I do not care to enter into any public controversy on the subject of Sacco and Vanzetti. I have done my duty as a citizen with honesty and courage."

* * * * *

The legislature of Massachusetts meets annually, just after New Year's. There is a judicial council, a competent official board of jurists appointed to study the State's system of jurisprudence and to make recommendations to the legislature of desirable changes in the laws. In this eminent body's first report, after the executions of Sacco and Vanzetti, it recommended that power be vested in the supreme judicial court to review the evidence as well as the law points in appeals from the superior courts for new trials in murder cases. The legislature of 1928 ignored the recommendation. In its second report last winter the council returned to the subject, the nation-wide discussion of which had brought upon the Commonwealth much disagreeable criticism because of the grave doubts raised as to Judge Webster Thayer's impartiality:

> The council renews, with emphasis, its recommendation of last year that the scope of the appellate jurisdiction of the supreme judicial court in murder cases be extended to include the unrestricted consideration of every judicial act of the trial judge. This was a recommendation that followed the Sacco-Vanzetti case.

The recommendation was supported by the attorney general of the State and by the Massachusetts Bar Association. The joint judiciary committee of the legislature gave a public hearing on the bill proposed, in February. That was the last heard of it.

The legislature's evasive conduct is not mysterious. Friends of Judge Thayer would bitterly oppose such legislation on the ground that it reflected on his record in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Others would denounce it as a surrender to the detested Sacco-Vanzetti "cult" and the anarchists. Still others honestly think that the present limitation on the supreme court's jurisdiction is desirable in order to shorten "the law's delays," regardless of deplorable consequences in a particular case. So, in order to avoid an

* Reviewed by the writer in the August number of the *Survey Graphic.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embittered legislative conflict tearing open the whole Sacco-Vanzetti case, for which most of the honorable members have no stomach, the legislature does nothing. Yet the judicial council may renew its wise recommendation.

* * * * *

One day in mid-spring the newspapers reported Governor Allen's curt refusal to hear argument from the lawyer of the murderer Knowlton in favor of the appointment of an advisory committee of eminent citizens to conduct an independent inquiry into his client's trial, conviction, and sentence to death. In an annoying way that memorable precedent had come home to roost.

* * * * *

Then, on another day in the springtime, came news that two new ships of the Russian government had been christened, respectively, the Sacco and the Vanzetti.

One laughed.

* * * * *

Even now, so the newspapers tell us, the respectable, law-abiding promoters of a Sacco and Vanzetti memorial meeting, for August 23, find every hall in Boston closed, following the arbitrary refusal of the city authorities to open Faneuil hall to them.

For none of us, from the greatest to the humblest, has forgetting Sacco and Vanzetti become easy.

The Power of Two Ghosts

By GARDNER JACKSON

IF ever there was a man subjected to unbelievably trying and torturing handicaps while doing what he conceived to be his duty, that man was William G. Thompson, senior counsel for Sacco and Vanzetti, in the summer of 1927. Now for the first time there is a public document available setting forth in considerable detail the indignities and denials of common fairness which Mr. Thompson and his associate, Herbert B. Ehrmann, had to face during the investigation of the Sacco-Vanzetti case by ex-Governor Fuller of Massachusetts and the advisory committee headed by President Lowell of Harvard.

That document is the court record of the trial and conviction of Harry Canter on the charge of criminally libeling ex-Governor Fuller by reason of carrying a placard in front of the State House last October bearing the words, "Fuller—Murderer of Sacco and Vanzetti." Canter was found guilty by a Boston jury in the Superior Court May 25. The jury was charged by the late Judge Robert F. Raymond in such a manner that it could do nothing else but find Canter guilty. Judge Raymond sentenced him to a year's incarceration at the penal institution on Deer Island and refused to stay the sentence pending appeal to the Supreme Court of the State.

Mr. Thompson was summoned as chief witness for the defense and was on the stand under examination by Attorney Arthur Garfield Hays for more than two hours. He told of his unavailing attempts to induce ex-Governor Fuller to uphold the basic principle of the Anglo-Saxon theory of justice—namely, that no man shall be accused without an opportunity of hearing and answering his accusers.

Unsuccessful in his effort during his first interview with ex-Governor Fuller to make the latter see the primary importance of investigating first the question of the fairness of the Dedham trial of Sacco and Vanzetti and of Judge Webster Thayer's attitude then and during the subsequent seven motions for a new trial, Mr. Thompson testified that he "turned the discussion into an entirely different channel."

> I said [he testified]: "If you are determined to act here as a judge and jury and determine the entire question of innocence or guilt then I take it for granted that you will permit Mr. Ehrmann and myself to be present to hear the evidence against our clients, to cross-examine the witnesses, and if we see fit to do so, and are able to do so, to introduce evidence in contradiction of anything that may be said against them." To which he replied: "I will not," and Mr. Wiggin [the ex-Governor's counsel who sat with him throughout the investigation] said: "That would be to make a bear garden out of the hearing."
>
> I asked him what he meant by that and he said that he meant that it would create confusion or an undesirable situation at the State House. I said in reply to that: "If you mean to imply that I am incapable of conducting a proceeding of this kind with a reasonable amount of dignity you are mistaken and Mr. Wiggin knows you are mistaken. You have at your command a force of State police and various other functionaries who are perfectly able to keep order at any proceeding that may be conducted by you at the State House." I said: "Is that your real reason?" To which he said: "Well, there is another reason." I said: "I would be very glad if Your Excellency would tell me what it is." He said: "I am afraid if I should tell you or permit you to know the names of the people who come up here and testify against your clients some harm might come to them."
>
> I said: "Well, no harm has yet come to those who testified against them in Dedham [seven years previous]." I said: "That apprehension is absolutely without foundation." . . . I said to him: "Governor, even if it were true that there is danger that the sympathizers might do some harm, yet, nevertheless, you should not break down the tradition of a thousand years. You are undertaking to pass upon the question of the guilt or innocence of two men, and upon your decision depend two lives. Now, the thing that I am speaking of was not because of something that happened in court, but rather something that goes to the very foundation of judgment and of laws, the idea that no man should be condemned without hearing what is said against him and having an opportunity to meet it." I said: "It was true in Roman times and it has been true in Anglo-Saxon times since and it is true now." I said: "If you undertake to pass upon that general question and do it in secret, you can never do justice and you never can satisfy the conscience of mankind with that sort of proceeding."
>
> He said he did not agree with me, that he found that if people came to him privately and quietly, he as a business man was able to get the truth out of them a great deal more effectively than it could be got publicly or in court. I said: "That is an illusion characteristic of a certain type of business man, but it is a dangerous illusion, and it is an extremely bad precedent for you to introduce into the judicial history of Massachusetts."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And I said to him: "I want you to understand that if you take testimony against my clients secretly, behind closed doors, and do not let me know what is said, and you are going to reach a conclusion upon that basis, my protest must be recorded now and it will be repeated as often as I have an opportunity to do so."

But protest as he would, Mr. Thompson could not budge the Governor. It was literally true that Mr. Thompson had no way of knowing what witnesses went before the Governor except those defense witnesses who went at Mr. Thompson's suggestion. It was a thorough-going inquisitional procedure.

After elaborating at great length on the evidence he presented to the Governor, Mr. Thompson turned to the question of Judge Thayer.

I said to him [the Governor]: "How are you going in the future to justify letting these men go to their death when you have got affidavits from George Crocker and Professor Richardson of Dartmouth College, perfectly reputable men, men of high standing, without the slightest taint of radicalism, substantial citizens, when you have got a man holding the position of judge in this State asking one of those men whether he does not think the charge which he intends to give the next morning will hold the defendants, tells how the community is in great danger of radicalism and all that sort of thing, and when Professor Richardson writes a letter to the Governor and says that on the football field at Dartmouth College in the presence of a large number of men, some students and some instructors, this man voluntarily steps up to them and says, 'Did you see what I did to those anarchistic bastards yesterday?' "

I said: "Do you think, Governor, when that thing comes to be appreciated that that has been said by a judge of the Superior Court about two men on trial for their lives, one of them a married man with two little children, do you think you will get away with it, when you do not even tell me whether Judge Thayer admitted or denied saying that and when your own Advisory Committee refused to say whether Judge Thayer admitted or denied that, and when I do not know how to argue it, and I said so to President Lowell and President Lowell said to me: 'You may argue on the theory that he admitted it and then you may argue on the assumption that he denied it.'?"

I said: "If this matter was not so serious it would be a farce." I said: "You will bring a disgrace on this Commonwealth that will not be overcome in a century." I said: "Do not imagine that you will be protected when this thing is all printed and when disinterested, scholarly men get hold of it, do not think you can shield yourself under the ..... of Mr. Lowell or anybody else. You will stand stark alone for having permitted a disgrace to be perpetrated in this Commonwealth of Massachusetts, because at the moment a great mass of public opinion, not knowing the danger of it, is urging you to do it, and is filling the papers and public places with denunciation of Sacco and Vanzetti and everybody connected with it."

I said: "I have lost about twenty-five thousand dollars in this case through my activities, in office salaries, business falling off, and one thing and another. I thought when I started off that these men were guilty, and I took it for granted, like everybody else, that a radical must be guilty. But I came to know these men, and when I came to know these men—I have been at it for seven years—I find that the public has a total misconception of what these men are. If Vanzetti had an education he would have been a professor in Harvard College. He is one of the most gifted men that I know of. I have heard him give a most enlightening talk on Ralph Waldo Emerson, he has discussed Shelley's poems with me and I have heard him use words that I have had to go home and look in the Century Dictionary to find the meaning of. He is a dreamer and an idealist.

"He is as incapable of going out and committing murder for profit or gain as Phillips Brooks was. All this talk that you are dealing with a bomb thrower and a violent, dangerous criminal, is all nonsense. A horrible blunder is being made, and all this hue and cry that this man is a murderer is simply due to the slowness of the general public to catch on to something out of the ordinary course. I am here trying to protect the general community from making a most horrible mistake, and there is a most horrible mistake being made. I do not care anything about Vanzetti's beliefs. He knows I do not believe in them at all. You are making ten radicals for every one that there is now. You are hurting the people of this Commonwealth by letting this thing go through."

Of all the illuminating material Mr. Thompson gave on the stand, none is perhaps more indicative of ex-Governor Fuller's attitude of mind during the investigation than this bit relating to Mr. Fuller's interview with Madeiros who while under sentence for another killing confessed to being in the murder car.

Madeiros said [Mr. Thompson testified] that the Governor had come down to see him and that the Governor began the interview by saying that he understood that Madeiros said that he thought he had been given—I think the expression was "a raw deal," or something indicating double dealing or improper dealing by the government, and that Madeiros said that Officer Ferrari of the State police had given him promise of second-degree murder if he confessed the murder (a Wrentham bank murder), and that was given to Mr. Brooks at the State House who had a good deal to do with criminal cases (on the parole board). The Governor said if he was satisfied that any such promise had been made he would do something for Madeiros. The Governor then said, before waiting for any reply from Madeiros, according to Madeiros's statement to me: "You do not know anything about the Sacco-Vanzetti case, do you?" And Madeiros said he did and the Governor asked him if he was in the car with the other men who committed the murder in South Braintree, the South Braintree murder, and Madeiros said he was, and the Governor then said, "So you are a double murderer: I will do nothing for you."

Mr. Thompson's testimony, which was submitted as offer of proof for the Canter defense with the jury excused, was supplemented by significant testimony from John F. Moors, Boston banker, who testified that during one of his interviews with the Governor on the case the latter clearly showed that he did not even know that the Pinkerton detective reports exonerating Vanzetti had been submitted to him by Mr. Thompson. When Mr. Moors asked the Governor about them, the Governor turned to his secretary and said: "Do you know anything about some Pinkerton reports?" And this was far along in the investigation.

All in all the Canter trial record is a rich mine of material for the student of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. The record may get a wider airing if a Canter appeal is pushed in the Supreme Court in the fall. In any event the record will stand to plague Massachusetts for years to come.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Great Editor

By JOHN A. HOBSON

THE retirement of Mr. C. P. Scott from the editorship of his paper, the Manchester *Guardian,* has been the occasion of a testimonial of regret, admiration, and good-will, from the press of his own and other countries, that is unique in the history of journalism. When he entered upon the editorship in 1872 it was a newspaper of the second rank in a large provincial English city. Today an impartial panel of international journalists would probably pronounce it the best newspaper in the world. By such a verdict they would not signify that its direct influence upon politics and trade, or in the sphere of intellectual culture, exceeds that of several other journals in its own and other lands. Indeed, it is no longer true today that Lancashire holds the place it did a century ago, either in commerce or in political initiative, when it could be said that "what Lancashire thinks today, England will think tomorrow." Though the steady strength of the Manchester *Guardian* is still drawn from the keen-minded, sober, energetic character of the most thickly peopled area of industrial England, its wider reputation must be imputed to the wisdom, courage, and ceaseless energy of its great editor. The central skill of his achievement lay in utilizing the needs and opportunities of the population and trade of Lancashire as the business basis of an organ of general human culture. Steadily he kept in mind his duty to his provincial readers, but he strove unceasingly to make them less provincial, widening their horizon, stimulating their minds with information and interpretations of significant events in the larger world. Perhaps his chief wisdom was seen in the selection and training of an editorial staff of able young men capable of entering into this tradition. Many of the most famous men in our journalism and letters have at one time or another served upon this staff. In earlier days we may mention Sir Arthur Evans and Mr. W. T. Arnold, among recent writers the brilliant novelist and essayist Mr. C. E. Montague and the great sociologist Professor L. T. Hobhouse, whose untimely death we are now deploring. Mr. Scott succeeded in the difficult task of reconciling personal liberty of thought in his writers with a common purpose, to a quite unusual extent. He recognized always that the former was as essential to the character of his paper as the latter. At a time when journalism was steadily drifting from a profession into a trade or business, he took a firm stand for the higher calling. Not merely to print "what the public wants," but to mold the public mind and supply its real needs, was the task he undertook. It is sometimes said that the continued performance of this task is impracticable, seeing that no newspaper can live without a large advertisement income, that advertising depends on circulation, and people will not buy a paper to have their minds improved. Perhaps the chief service of the Manchester *Guardian* is its practical refutation of this cynical judgment. Though its regular readers may be what Matthew Arnold called "the remnant," the size and influence of that remnant are sufficient. Supported also by a wider outer circle of readers intelligent enough to prefer reliable to highly spiced news, the *Guardian* has for over a century had a substantial, though not a highly lucrative, business career.

This has not been achieved without incurring risks and sacrifices impossible for a "grocery press." Mr. Scott has been almost the only survivor of the old tradition of owner-editor, who himself lives by the living word he writes and sells. While this position has its dangers, where ownership comes first, and there are personal axes to grind or interests to serve, it has the inestimable advantage of securing absolute freedom for the current conduct of the paper, and a continuity of policy deriving from the personality of its responsible head. This is of peculiar importance in the case of a journal which has always taken for its foremost duty the direction of political thought along the highroad of principle, without that constant deference to passing opportunity which the lighter-minded journals cultivate. For there are occasions when such an editor will espouse a policy which may be so unpopular as to inflict a serious damage on his paper as a property, even to threaten its very existence. No hired journalist can undertake such risks. He must either yield to the fears and remonstrances of the owner, or he must quit. Several instances in the recent history of English journalism serve to illustrate the perils of this vacillation and unfreedom. The Manchester *Guardian* under its great editor has never felt the necessity of walking delicately when a firm step was required. It has been strong enough to challenge a popular misjudgment, and by patient reasoning to convert public opinion. Its attitude of persistent opposition to the Boer War was a most striking example of the courage and success of this conduct. Though the jingo boycott, to which the paper was subjected in the passionate heat of that conflict, threatened it with ruin, it emerged with a heightened respect and confidence due, partly, to a sense of sportsmanship in its Lancashire public, partly, to the dawning recognition that the *Guardian* had been right in denouncing the South African war as a disastrous and costly blunder. Thus it has come to pass that the courage and integrity of this great newspaper have gained wide recognition outside the ranks of its political adherents. This was demonstrated most impressively a few years ago, when the Conservative Lord Derby presided at a great banquet to celebrate Mr. Scott's jubilee as editor.

The great political service rendered by Mr. Scott has been what may be termed the making of a new liberalism in Manchester, the Mecca of the old. For half a century, while steadily adhering to the Victorian principles of peace, economy, and electoral reform, the editorial policy of the *Guardian* has steadily moved on from a laissez-faire conception of the duties of the state to a large constructive conception of the part which government must play in securing and developing economic and personal liberties. It is no mere coincidence that a large part of the initiative in the recent Liberal Yellow Book, the gospel of new Liberalism, should have come from a little group of politicians, publicists, and business men in Lancashire. To Mr. Scott and his fellow-workers political liberty was never a merely, or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mainly, negative conception. While freedom of trade and of business enterprise continued to be fundamental conditions of a sound society, while pacific internationalism and economy of defense were objects of vital importance, there was a growing sense that these foundations of policy existed to be built upon, and that a positive edifice of liberty involved a new conception of government and the part it must take in the cooperative processes of social progress. Thus stated, this may sound a vague generalization. But, in point of fact, our political life has been absorbing more and more of this conscious policy of political institutions for the support of life whose freedom consists in opportunities for the larger and more various realization of human personality. In recent years rapid economic evolution has gone far to dispel the illusions of absolute self-reliance and competing private enterprise in the economic sphere. Combination, cooperation, rationalization, terms pressing the business world, are visibly changing the functions of government. Politics and economics are meeting and even merging at many points. Not only national, but especially international, high politics are seen to be suffused with business considerations. Thus governments are compelled to undertake new functions of industrial control, of finance, of labor legislation, and of international cooperation, which are transforming the art of politics. In the liberal press of Europe no paper has been so active in the conscious formation of this new social-economic policy as the Manchester *Guardian,* and the recent rapprochement between Liberalism and Labor, which in spite of difficulties, party and personal, is steadily advancing, is in no small measure due to this more liberal interpretation of Liberalism in a party which, left to the obsolescent policies of the Gladstonian or Asquithian schools, was doomed to early extinction. The actual fate of the Liberal Party and its press is an interesting topic for speculation. But it is no rash prophecy to state that the English Liberalism of the future can survive only by an effective cooperation with Labor, helping, as it would, to moderate and rationalize the socialism which modern life requires and to which all progressive sections of our political parties are virtually committed. To have been a pioneer in this great political work will be a legitimate source of pride to the great editor in his well-earned retirement.

American or Foreigner?

By J. MARK JACOBSON

I

A FEW days ago the police of Budapest prevented a nineteen-year-old shoemaker from jumping off the Elizabeth bridge into the Danube. This hapless young man, born of a Polish father and a Hungarian mother in the town of Munkach, which is now in Czecho-Slovakia, had been deported by the Hungarian authorities to Czecho-Slovakia, only to be sent on to Poland as a Pole, and by the Poles deported back to Hungary. Three times he made this round, and then, unable, in consequence of the conflict of laws, to find any foothold in this world, wearily determined to try his chances in the next.

Americans of American origin have been unaware of the perplexing problem of nationality confronting the newer American—and utterly indifferent to it; but a World War followed by a quota immigration act has forcibly impressed on thousands of our first and second-generation Americans the disastrous clash of varying nationality laws, which deny to some men all nationality and burden others with double citizenship. This conflict of laws arises from the clash of two diametrically opposite rules of nationality, *ius sanguinis* (law of blood) and *ius soli* (law of the soil). Italy, for example, holding to the first of these principles, claims jurisdiction over the children of Italian parents no matter if they are born in New Zealand or Kamchatka. Other nations, on the other hand, claim as their own citizens all who are born within their territory, regardless of the nationality of their parents.

The United States holds to both the law of the soil and the law of the blood, and mixes with these the principle of naturalization; the result is unparalleled complexity and confusion. Fundamentally, we approach the problem of nationality from the English common-law viewpoint, attaching nationality to the soil; but gradually we have approached the law of the blood and have also permitted the naturalization of nationals of other states, while continental European countries, starting from the law of the blood, have incorporated certain aspects of the law of the soil. The nationality laws of the United States may accordingly be classified into three groups, based upon the law of the soil, the law of the blood, and the naturalization of aliens. In examining our nationality laws, we must bear in mind that wherever we hold to the law of the blood some other state may have adopted the law of the soil, that where we adopt the latter principle Romance nations usually employ the law of the blood, and that while we permit the naturalization of aliens many countries refuse to recognize American naturalization of their nationals.

II

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution clearly establishes the law of the soil as the basic principle for the determination of American nationality. It provides that "All persons born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

This simple rule of nationality, however, fails to solve the problem for the millions of American-born children and grandchildren of immigrants. Although the Fourteenth Amendment makes them all American citizens, under the nationality laws of some Romance and eastern European nations they belong to the countries from which their fathers or grandfathers had emigrated. Several countries, notably Italy, Greece, and Turkey, believe in an indelible, perpetual allegiance. Italy claims as her own the children of Italians born in any corner of the world, not merely the children of recent emigrants, but even the children of seventh-generation emigrants.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ghiloni case illustrates the sort of controversy that arises in consequence. Ghiloni was born in the United States in 1885 while his father, an Italian immigrant, was not yet naturalized. At the outbreak of the war Ghiloni was visiting in Italy. Under the Fourteenth Amendment he was a native-born American citizen; under the Italian code, however, he was an Italian subject, and despite the protests of our State Department, he was forced into the Italian army. The Da Prato case went even further. Though Da Prato's father, a naturalized American, had taken out his papers before his son was born, the young man, who had been studying architecture in Italy for two years, was seized for military service at the oubreak of the war.

III

Though we protest against the application of the law of the blood by foreign states to individuals born on American soil, yet we enforce this same law of the blood in our own nationality rules. According to our law, children born "out of the limits and jurisdiction of the United States, whose fathers were or may be at the time of their birth, citizens thereof" are American citizens. Such a child continuing to reside outside of the United States, may at the age of eighteen record at an American consulate his intention of remaining a citizen of the United States and of becoming a resident of this country. Upon attaining his majority he must confirm his affirmation by taking an oath of allegiance to the United States.

Contrast with this arrangement Section 2172 of our Revised Statutes, under which foreign-born minor children living in the United States at the time their father is naturalized automatically become American citizens. In fact, a foreign-born child, though still living in his native land when his parent is naturalized, becomes a citizen of the United States if, while still a minor, he begins to reside permanently in the United States.

Not all children, however, acquire citizenship through the naturalization of their fathers. Foreign-born children of naturalized American citizens who do not come to this country to live until they are twenty-one or more years of age, and foreign-born children who are no longer minors at the time their fathers become American citizens remain foreigners. In addition, the status of step-children and adopted children is not affected by the citizenship of their new fathers.

IV

The American rules of nationality were sufficiently complex before 1922. Prior to that year we had accepted the common-law, unilateral system of nationality; the nationality of a wife and her children followed that of her husband, and the family was thus treated as a unit. But the insistence of twentieth-century American feminists resulted in the passage of the Cable Act of September 22, 1922. This legislation substituted a bilateral system of nationality for the previous unilateral system, and destroyed the family as a unit in the naturalization process.

The important provisions of this act are four in number. First, the naturalization of a husband does not *ipso facto* give his wife American citizenship; she herself must now go through the naturalization process. Second, the marriage of an alien woman to an American citizen does not secure for her American nationality; she must be naturalized the same as any other foreign-born woman. Third, an American woman upon marriage to an alien may elect to retain her American nationality. And fourth, a woman who has lost her American nationality through marriage to an alien may, upon the dissolution of the marriage, elect to reacquire her American citizenship.

The Cable Act has thrown the nationality status of married women into chaos, and has resulted in denying to many women all nationality, either American or foreign. For example, an official in the United States consular service stationed abroad was in 1922 married in England to a British woman, and they afterwards sought to come to the United States. The wife was discovered to be ineligible to an American passport, since under the Cable Act she had not by her marriage acquired American nationality. On the other hand, under the British Act of 1914 she had lost her British nationality on her marriage to a non-British subject, so she was denied a British passport. Under section 2 of the Cable Act she could have been naturalized after only one year's residence in the United States, if she came to this country; but she could not get a passport to come.

Yet again, an American woman marries an Italian; she goes with her husband to live in Italy and gives up her American citizenship. Her husband dies or divorces her, and she decides to reacquire her surrendered American nationality. Under the laws both of the United States and of Italy, her children, no matter how young, remain subjects of Italy. She can return to the United States, but must leave her children behind to await their turn under the overcrowded Italian quota.

To summarize the situation, while a foreign woman marrying an American citizen does not in any case acquire American nationality, she does lose her original nationality in twenty countries,* under the rule that the nationality of a wife follows that of her husband. Twenty-seven countries,† however, make exceptions to this rule, and permit a wife under varying conditions and restrictions to retain her original nationality in case her husband's country refuses to let her assume his citizenship. In Sweden, for example, a woman who marries a foreigner may retain her Swedish nationality unless she leaves Sweden permanently. In Denmark she may remain a Dane only if she continues to live in Denmark. In Belgium she has six months after her marriage in which to ask to keep her nationality; otherwise she loses it. In Esthonia the period of grace is only two weeks. In only six countries—Argentina, Chile, Panama, Russia, Uruguay, and the United States—may a woman by her own right keep her own nationality upon her marriage to an alien.

V

The Fourteenth Amendment, in addition to establishing the law of the soil as the test for American nationality, provides for the acquisition of American citizenship by naturalization. After a residence of five years in this country, nationals of foreign states are permitted to abandon their former allegiance and to become citizens of the United

* Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Bolivia, British India, Canada, Cuba, Czecho-Slovakia, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Latvia, Haiti, the Netherlands, Palestine, Persia, Spain, Switzerland, Venezuela, Iraq.

† Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Esthonia, France, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Monaco, Portugal, Rumania, Sweden, Costa Rica, Egypt, Salvador, Jugoslavia, Danzig, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Syria, Iceland.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States. Immediately, the problem of dual allegiance arises. Up to sixty years ago European nations refused to recognize our right to naturalize their subjects, and they endeavored to hold naturalized American citizens as nationals of their home countries. Some few foreign states, notably Italy, Greece, and Turkey, believing, as previously stated, in an indelible, perpetual allegiance, still refuse to recognize American naturalization; while most European countries permit only a limited naturalization of their nationals.

The problem of dual nationality, accordingly, has always been a troublesome one in our diplomatic history. It was one of the many grievances that led to the War of 1812 against England. Ever since 1845, when Buchanan as Secretary of State first enunciated our general policy, we have considered the right of nationals to change their allegiance as natural and inalienable. Congress in 1868 instructed the executive to extend the same protection abroad to naturalized as to native-born citizens. The Bancroft-Bismarck treaty of that same year with the North German Confederation marks the first international agreement permitting even a limited expatriation. Since then we have succeeded in concluding such treaties with several nations: England, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Austria-Hungary, Ecuador, Denmark, and Haiti.

While we have thus made progress in securing recognition of American naturalization, nevertheless a number of states have nationality laws which raise the question of dual nationality for hundreds of thousands of naturalized and even native-born American citizens. Twelve countries —Austria, Ecuador, Monaco, Norway, Persia, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Japan, Belgium-Congo, and Danzig—permit the naturalization of their nationals only if the persons desiring naturalization have first secured the consent of their home governments. Twelve other states—Bulgaria, China, Esthonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Madagascar, Persia, Poland, Jugoslavia, and Turkey —permit the expatriation of their nationals only after they have performed their required military training. A national of one of these states acquires American citizenship by naturalization, but is denied by his own home country release from his original allegiance; he is thus burdened with a dual nationality.

VI

The clash of nationality results in double taxation, loss of diplomatic protection, and liability to military service. In consequence, as Frances Kellor points out in her book, "Immigration and the Future":

> Aliens in America see very little advantage in acquiring a citizenship which makes them and their sons born in America liable to foreign military service; and naturalized citizens point out that in some countries little respect is paid to American citizenship. The native-born American has been indifferent and has allowed this matter to drift, largely because he has never realized its tremendous importance to foreign-born people in America and to their standing abroad.

Since the problem of nationality is both international and domestic, a satisfactory solution demands international as well as national consideration. The League of Nations through its Committee of Experts for the Progressive Codification of International Law in January, 1926, drew up a preliminary draft convention that embodied practical answers to a few of the many questions involved. The failure of our government to cooperate with this committee prevented the ripening of this fruitful movement. This question is now being studied by a group of experts at the Harvard Law School in preparation for the coming Hague Convention for the codification of international law.

Commissioner of Naturalization Raymond F. Crist, in his 1926 report to Congress, said:

> The elimination of all methods of conferring citizenship upon persons of foreign birth except the one of direct petition for naturalization would go far toward paving the way for a uniform recognition of citizenship by nations throughout the world. . . . It is recommended that citizenship be recognized as acquired only by birth within the United States, or, in all future naturalizations, by direct petition for naturalization in cases of birth outside the United States.

Should legislation of this nature be adopted, it would be necessary to repeal our laws granting American citizenship to minor children born abroad, whether now resident in the United States or abroad, upon the naturalization of their fathers.

However, the major problems of the conflict of nationality result from the duality of nationality through naturalization, from the nationality laws for women, and from the clash of the diametrically opposed law of the soil and law of the blood. Such basic conflicts can be eliminated only through international conference and action that harmonizes the rules of the several countries. It is an international, not a purely national, task.

In the Driftway

CLARENCE K. STREIT typewrites from Geneva (Switzerland, not New York) to cast doubt upon the theory which the Drifter advanced in the issue of July 10 that the Young Men's Christian Association gave the cigarette its greatest boost toward respectability and popularity. The Drifter said (as his readers will not recall) that by tacitly removing its ban from cigarette smoking during the World War the Y. M. C. A. made "coffin nails" respectable for men, a necessary preliminary to becoming respectable among women. Characterizing this idea as a "theory in fact's clothing," Mr. Streit endeavors to deflate it as follows:

> My own driftings once washed me ashore at Samsoun, Turkey. There I found three veteran American tobacco buyers engaged in the philanthropic task of selecting the best of the gorgeous leaf that honors that region for export to America. I learned about cigarettes from them.
>
> Loath as all ex-soldiers of my acquaintance are to remove any wreath—be it even a wreath of cigarette smoke —from the brow of the Y. M. C. A., I must inform you that the reasons these men who had grown up in the trade gave for the cigarette's rise in popularity did not include a faint allusion to the Y. They told me that the greatest boost the American cigarette ever got came when some anonymous tobacco man hit upon the idea of blending with the American leaf the more aromatic and easier burning one of Turkey. They showed me with figures how our importations of Turkish tobacco had grown from year to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year since then, and how cigarette sales had followed the same upward curve.

They reminded me that all the popular American cigarette brands contained some Turkish leaf. They would take such cigarettes, break them open, roll the contents in their hands and, after a quick eye-open test which I fear none of the makers for whom they buy would advertise, they would tell me all that was in them and would contemptuously toss them away.

"If you want a real smoke," they told me, "try one of these." And they gave me a box of a thousand of the cigarettes that they have made for their own enjoyment. They were made of the pure Samsoun leaf. Don't blow that smoke away!

Honest-to-godly,

CLARENCE K. STREIT

* * * * *

THE Drifter has no desire to "blow that smoke away." On the contrary, he wishes some of it might blow his way. But all aroma aside, and with that denseness that is always so useful in an argument, he doesn't see how Mr. Streit's delightful experience demolishes the theory of the benefit of clergy derived by the cigarette from the Y. M. C. A. Doubtless it is true that the blending of native tobacco with Turkish was a long step in the progress of the cigarette. At the same time the cigarette has become enormously popular in England, although the most favored brands there have had no admixture of Turkish leaf. It might be observed in rebuttal that neither have they had any admixture of Y. M. C. A. But the Drifter has a further argument in reserve. The blending of native tobacco with Turkish in the making of cigarettes was common in this country more than a quarter of a century ago. In fact the Drifter cannot recall definitely from the mists of time the pre-Turkish era. He believes that the first cigarettes he knew were Sweet Caporals, made entirely of native tobacco. But he never smoked them. That was before his fair, young lips had been stained by the weed. The first cigarettes which the Drifter recalls through smoking them contained an admixture of Turkish tobacco. Turkish Trophies and Egyptian Deities were well-known brands in the early years of this century. The Drifter recalls Trophies better than Deities; they were cheaper.

* * * * *

BUT though the blending of native tobacco with Turkish in the making of cigarettes in America goes back at least to the early years of this century, the product was still dubbed "coffin nails" for a long time after. The popularity of the cigarette grew steadily (and perhaps Turkish tobacco had much to do with its rise), but right up to the World War it was still frowned upon as noxious by large numbers of Americans (including most mothers), and the Y. M. C. A. forbade smoking in its buildings. Its change of heart during the war, and its transmission of thousands of cigarettes to our troops overseas, took the curse off the "coffin nail" and would seem to be the great boost which put it over the top as our most popular kind of smoke—a permissible pastime for men, and soon after for women.

* * * * *

ANYHOW Mr. Streit's theory was made in Switzerland. It is a product of the pauper labor of Europe and should not be admitted to this country.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Einstein and Science

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I do not recollect ever having read anything touching on a scientific or engineering subject in a popular daily or weekly or monthly, which did not contain some absolute nonsense. "Einstein is right" and "Einstein is wrong" have become nauseating headlines, and the number of other sensational statements in connection with the Einstein theories is legion. "Walking on Air," "Light is Curved," "The End of Universe," "Split Atoms Can Destroy the World," etc., recur now and then even in papers and magazines that do not otherwise cater to the sensational. This is not altogether the fault of the editors or the poor reporters who are forced by the nature of their profession to do a great amount of uninformed writing on more subjects than it is possible for any human being to master. They have to take the words of "experts" for granted, and since it is very difficult for them to reach the real experts, the modest scientists who are not very anxious to see their names in newspaper headlines, they have to depend on the pseudo-experts who are every ready to take advantage of the work of other men to get their own names in front of the public.

Is it possible that *The Nation* has joined the ranks of the "science baiters"? I refer to your editorial article, Science and Certitude. Every scientific theory, in the course of its development, calls for some corrections and modifications, principally through the serious efforts and investigations of other scientists. Is this a sufficient reason for you to give your readers the impression that scientists don't know what they are talking about? Your remark about the "validity of purely mathematical inferences" is quite nonsensical. Don't you know that mathematics is an empirical science, that it is only used for the purpose of simplifying human reasoning, as a mechanic uses his tools to simplify and speed up his work? The use of higher mathematics in physics is no more "purely mathematical inference" than is your own use of simple arithmetic, instead of taking off your shoes to allow you to add up to twenty with the aid of your toes. If there is one thing which can be checked and found either right or wrong it is a mathematical formula. A purely mathematical inference once checked is never wrong. What is often found to require a correction is a physical constant or variable, which is obtained purely by observation. The whole progress of science is made up of just such corrections.

New York, July 23 M. M. SAMUELS

[The author of this letter can hardly accuse us of having asserted either that "Einstein is right" or that "Einstein is wrong." Our attitude was simply one of complete skepticism, and we implied a belief that neither the proponents nor the opponents of the Einstein theory had any conclusive evidence to support their side of the argument. We wholly agree with Mr. Samuels that the physical scientist should use mathematics "as a mechanic uses his tools to simplify and speed up his work." But we contended that Einstein's Field Theory appeared to be the result of a piece of pure mathematical reasoning which has as yet little or no empirical evidence in its favor. As to the statement that "mathematics is an empirical science," we are surprised to hear it made and we must confess that we are not yet able to understand the statement that it is. Surely Mr. Samuels's assertion is quite unorthodox and not likely to be accepted by the many mathematicians who regard their science as being, on the contrary, the highest possible development of pure logic and as such quite independent of experience.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Marion Strike

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The strike at Marion, N. C., ought to interest your readers. Seven hundred men and women on July 11 left their places in a cotton mill when R. W. Baldwin, president of the Marion Manufacturing Company, who has boasted throughout the country of his "garden" mill village, refused to decrease their hours from 12 hours and 20 minutes to 10 hours a day, and refused to reinstate twenty-two workers discharged for joining the United Textile Workers of America.

I am happy to say that the leadership in the strike has been of high calibre. Alfred Hoffman, graduate of Brookwood, and active in the early stages of the Elizabethton strike, has been an intelligent leader; Tom Tippett has been working and talking untiringly; A. J. Muste, dean of Brookwood, delivered a series of inspiring talks to the strikers; and William Ross of Baltimore Labor College has started regular workers' classes.

The men and women of Marion are devoted, sef-sacrificing, and in spite of injunctions, their picket line is as strong as steel. They are fighting in this strike for modest demands and they are determined to get them. In the meantime, they and fifteen hundred dependents, the sick, the young, and the old, must be fed. The Emergency Committee for Strikers' Relief, Norman Thomas, chairman, has been the great sustaining force. We hope that your readers will send what they can to the new office of the committee at 112 East 19th Street, New York City.

New York, August 1 Jack Herling

Denmark's National Anthem

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It is not quite correct, as Katharine Arthur states in the July 10 issue of *The Nation,* that the former Minister of Education in Denmark, Madame Nina Bang, had a law passed "forbidding audiences to rise during the national anthem as not good for the common people." No such law was passed, but the Socialist Cabinet of which Nina Bang was a member refused to pay its respects to the national anthem, "King Christian stood by the lofty mast . . . " because of its warlike contents. I would like to inform the readers of *The Nation* that the present Socialist Government in Denmark has substituted a more peaceful national hymn for the bombastic "King Christian" as the closing song of the State Radio Broadcasting programs, and that less blood-dripping songs are now being used at patriotic gatherings in Denmark.

Berkeley, California, July 10 Peter Guldbrandsen

Our Successor?

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Recently out of college, I am now looking for a job on your magazine. I am twenty, presentable, considerably above average in intelligence, and particularly interested in magazine work. I can write. I have written largely for school and college publications, have done a little newspaper work, and have earned my living through college thus far in most part by doing research work and writing. For this reason I have had little time until the present to concern myself with magazine work. Now, however, I am in quest of a permanent position.

I am not precocious merely: permit me to assure you that I am confident of being entirely capable of carrying through satisfactorily anything you may have to offer me. I can do anything from editing your magazine to hauling a load of copies down Fifth Avenue in a wheelbarrow—and I can be hired to do it. In case there is at the moment no one in your offices dead or dying, if you will give me any other kind of assistance, I will be very highly gratified.

New York, August 2 C. H.

For Debs's Biography

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: McAlister Coleman is completing a full-length biography of the late Eugene V. Debs which Greenberg: Publisher will issue early in the spring. Mr. Coleman will welcome any letters from or to Debs, authoritative anecdotes, and any other interesting information concerning the great labor leader. He will copy and return promptly all material sent to him at 103 East 10th Street, New York City.

New York, August 6 Greenberg: Publisher

Sacco-Vanzetti Meeting

The Sacco-Vanzetti Memorial Committee, unable to obtain a hall in Boston, will hold its Second Anniversary Meeting in the Town Hall, 113 West 43rd Street, New York City, on Friday, August 23, at 8.30 P. M.

The Nation Radio Hour—Every Monday at 8 P. M.
526M.—WMCA—570 K.
August 19—Mr. Warner
August 26—Mr. Mussey

Contributors to This Issue

Waldo L. Cook, editor of the Springfield *Republican,* has been a careful student of the Sacco-Vanzetti case.

Gardner Jackson was a leading member of the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee.

John A. Hobson is a foremost British economist and a contributing editor of *The Nation.*

J. Mark Jacobson is instructor in political science at the University of Wisconsin.

Robert P. Tristram Coffin is professor of English at Wells College.

Robert Livingston Schuyler is professor of history at Columbia University.

Dudley Nichols is on the staff of the New York *World.*

Clarence Britten contributed the essay "School and College Life" to the volume "Civilization in the United States."

Morton Dauwen Zabel is professor of English literature at Loyola University and one of the editors of *Poetry: a Magazine of Verse.*

William MacDonald is a regular contributor to *The Nation.*

Alexander Bakshy, author of several books on the theater, writes frequently on motion pictures for *The Nation.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Films

There Yet Survived a God

By ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

They lived together in a house
Too big for women growing old;
One after one, they closed the doors
On rooms surrendered to the cold.

They had too many things to keep
Against the stealthy moth and sun,
Too many keepsakes to protect
Ever to think of using one.

Their lives contracted till at last
Their orbit was the kitchen fire;
They sat to think where they had cooked,
Empty of comment and desire.

Keen ways they learned to keep their souls
From filling one another's need;
They found each other's tender spots
And knew best how to make them bleed.

The sparrows and the robins made
Their love each year around their gate;
Inside the house two women aged
And sat together in their hate.

Heaven lit the appletrees
Beyond the kerbing of their well;
Inside four walls, in one small room,
There was room enough for hell.

Yet there was something holy, too,
In their fine art of giving pain;
They moved like ancient tragedy,
Single as martyrs in old Spain.

In these years of aimlessness,
Among our lives without design,
It was as if there yet survived
A god to offer poisoned wine.

Beginnings of Empire

The Cambridge History of the British Empire. General Editors: J. Holland Rose, A. P. Newton, and E. A. Benians. Vol. I: *The Old Empire from the Beginnings to 1783.* The Macmillan Company. $9.50.

THE Cambridge History of the British Empire, of which the long-awaited first volume has at length appeared, promises to be true to type. Like the other monumental histories which bear the name of Cambridge it is to be a comprehensive and voluminous work of cooperative scholarship, consisting of contributions by many specialists, intended for the use of students and for reference rather than for the general reader. It has been planned, the editors tell us, upon the lines of the Cambridge Modern History. Of the eight volumes which it is to include the first three will relate to British expansion and imperial policy from the sixteenth to the early twentieth century; the next two, specially edited by Professor H. H. Dodwell, will deal with the history of British India; and the last three, the Dominion volumes, will be concerned respectively with Canada and Newfoundland, Australia and New Zealand, and South Africa. The history of the most recent of the Dominions, the Irish Free State, falls outside the scope of the enterprise, of which the *terminus ad quem* is the year 1921. The fortunes of the crown colonies and other parts of the dependent empire are to receive consideration in the first three volumes in connection with the general history of imperial development. It is the hope of the editors that the work as a whole "will exhibit the present state of knowledge of the subject and lay a foundation on which future generations of students may build." There can be little doubt that it will take its place as the most authoritative, as it will certainly be the most complete, general history of the British Empire.

The first volume, consisting of twenty-six chapters, an elaborate bibliography, and an index, runs to well over nine hundred large and closely printed pages. It brings the history of the empire from its beginnings to the close of the American Revolution, and nowhere else within the covers of a single volume can so adequate and scholarly a treatment of the subject be found. Though the local history of the English colonies in North America and the West Indies is not wholly neglected, the general point of view is imperial, not colonial, British, not American. To emphasize the course of imperial development was the main object of the editors in planning the volume. With the exception of Professor Andrews of Yale all of the fifteen contributors are British, the list including such competent and well-known scholars as Sir Charles Lucas, J. Holland Rose, J. A. Williamson, A. P. Newton, W. F. Reddaway, Cecil Headlam, H. W. Temperley, A. Pearce Higgins, and the late H. E. Egerton. The work is thus prevailingly British in authorship, but the note of British patriotism is rarely sounded. The tone is scientific and the treatment objective. The chapters on the American Revolution would not pass muster with Mayor Thompson and the D. A. R., but informed persons will find in them no evidence of anti-American bias. Patriotic American myths are not, of course, accepted, but there is no disposition to minimize or palliate blunders of British imperial statesmanship.

Some literary historian—Mr. Philip Guedalla, I think—has asserted that histories of the Cambridge type are unreadable. This is an exaggeration, but it is not to be expected that a work of the scope and character of this volume will be read from cover to cover by very many people. Even by historical students it will be read *in* rather than *through*. It is fortunate, therefore, that in addition to the chronologically articulated chapters there are several which are self-contained essays. Such are the excellent discussion of Mercantilism and the Colonies by Professor Rees of the University of Birmingham, the thoughtful study of The Constitution and the Empire by Professor Ewing of Rhodes University College, South Africa, and the interesting appraisal of The Literature and Social Life of the Old Empire by the late Professor Egerton.

The bibliography, which is based upon materials furnished by contributors and edited by Miss Lillian Penson, deserves special mention and commendation. It contains a general bibliography, in which all the more important documentary sources, printed and unprinted, official and non-official, are listed, with select special bibliographies on exploration and sea power, colonial policy, the history of the colonies, and the American Revolution. The former should prove of service to research students, and the latter to any readers who may desire further information on subjects dealt with in the text.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Underworld

In the Reign of Rothstein. By Donald Henderson Clarke. Vanguard Press. $2.50.

DONALD HENDERSON CLARKE knew Rothstein. I did not know him, but once I saw him. The telephone had called me out of bed and presently the closed car stopped below my window in Charles Street and, muffled into my overcoat, I joined the two men on the rear seat. We went to Lindy's and it was 2 a. m. . . . The business in hand is not pertinent here, but while we sat and discussed a story which was later to break in the newspaper I was working for, my eyes went round the room, only my eyes let it be noted, for one did not turn one's head in Lindy's at 2 a. m. People had an admirable habit of attending their own affairs, ostensibly. Over the shoulder of the man who was talking to me I perceived Little Augie who had just succeeded to leadership of the Kid Dropper gang, an undersized, quiet youth who appeared about as dangerous as a rabbit in a coop until you saw his eyes, with which he seemed not to be looking at all but listening everywhere, contemptuously. Here were the night-hawks of Broadway, race-track men, pickpockets, confidence men, book-makers, gangsters, gamblers, and the respectable sports, so my two habitues told them off.

All at once the eyes of the man who was speaking to me shifted by the breadth of a hair and without changing tone or inserting a comma he said: "There's A R coming in the door don't turn your head for Christ's sake but take a look to your left easy-like after a while the good-looking fellow who shows his teeth as he smiles now as I was saying about this here." . . . And business went on as usual.

After a while I saw Arnold Rothstein. A handsome man of middle height, so I guessed, whose Fifth Avenue clothing set off a lithe, muscular figure beginning to take on weight but keeping a panther-like grace for all that. He had the balance and quick shifting grace of a welterweight prize-fighter, white skilful hands, black hair, and a pale, smooth, mobile face distinguished by beautiful gleaming teeth and amazingly vital, sparkling, brown eyes which hardly moved yet incessantly raked the restaurant from end to end, so that I knew that he was even aware of my unimportant but unaccustomed presence.

Beyond question this was an unusual man, an extraordinary man, handsome and debonair, with a humming brain under it all. You liked him. One gathers that Mr. Clarke, who tells us those beautiful teeth were artificial, liked him.

Here was Broadway's biggest big-money gambler. The type awakened a mingled sense of glamor and disgust, the latter very likely because of some unacknowledged identity in oneself. He pitted himself against all owning males and the weapon was the ringing, clinking one all men could wield, the blade more insidiously sharp at the hilt than at the point. The big-money gambler keeps close to his love; not even the one remove of the stock market will satisfy him, even though as a man of sense he must realize that money, like electric voltage, needs to be handled at a distance if great values are to be attained. He burns for the sweaty touch and clinch. The body of his love must be next to him always, a great roll of crisp, papery flesh secreted against his breast. Like a debased counterpart of the tragic saint in O'Neill's "Dynamo," who adores the vast, blind, godlike, dynamic power of the universe, he worships the vast static power of money which can buy of men and women everything except that which can only be given; and there is the dismal joke. For he does not die tragically in the arms of any dynamo, but meanly, insignificantly, untragically, with a bullet in his bowels. He is only removed.

Not that one means to say the joker is only dealt around in the underworld. How different is the dried-up, heaven-bent old man who hands out dimes to every stranger as a reminder to them and a reassurance to himself of the reality of his power over life? . . . But we shall not wander out of the underworld here, for Mr. Clarke's book is of that underworld, a New York newspaperman's passing knowledge of Broadway. Rothstein showed where he stood at the last, when detectives bent over the hospital bed to ask who shot him and he laid an index-finger against his dying lips. His business was cheating cheaters, but there was one partner he would not have. Mr. Clarke may well hazard that nobody will ever burn for the gambler's murder.

A R has been removed. Little Augie has met his bullet and been removed. The line is always forming on the wrong. . . . Mr. Clarke's book is rather a wax gallery of the Broadway he knows than a study of Arnold Rothstein, and character is only incidentally revealed through brief and unarticulated actions in the same way as it is now and then made clear in newspaper accounts. However, it will supplement the memories of New York newspapermen and give to outsiders a remarkable surface-cinema of a strange group of the type which constantly flares across Broadway and the tabloids.

DUDLEY NICHOLS

Meddling Through

The Mighty Medicine. By Franklin Henry Giddings. The Macmillan Company. $2.

Beyond Agnosticism. By Bernard Iddings Bell. Harper and Brothers. $2.

A Social Interpretation of Education. By Joseph Kinmont Hart. Henry Holt and Company. $4.50.

AS the religion of our time, our panacea for ills social and political, education has become about as difficult to define as liberty, which preceded it as mankind's hope of salvation. Here are three attempts at definition—by the Columbia sociologist, by the warden of St. Stephen's College, and by the expert who is a professor of the subject at Wisconsin. Each is dismayed by an alleged complacency with the educational establishment, though the simultaneous appearance of three such criticisms is an index to our actual discontent.

For Professor Giddings, speculative thought, which is a single-entry accounting of reality, is the way of belief; the way of knowledge is the double-entry accountancy of science, in which ideas are checked against sense data through the trial balance of repeated experiment. The one way is traditional and authoritarian, deriving from magic and fiatism as transmitted by an occult succession of medicine men for whom teaching is still largely a matter of incantation and of "imparting" an immaterial culture. This absolutist education fails in the application of intelligence and knowledge to the improvement of life; its fruits are passive sophistication or downright superstition, dogmatic environmentalism or the obscurantism of the "anti-evolution" laws.

It is not to weaken, rather to strengthen, this pithy putting of the liberal case against the schools that I interpolate a caution. The very ardor of the champion exhales an aroma of counter-obscurantism. "The solid realism of material culture" is of course indispensable, but must ordinary education therefore dispense with the immaterial culture bequeathed by introspection? And if it must, how shall it teach our literature, upon which the critic equally insists? Moreover, we had better avoid even the appearance of counter-dogmatism, at least until such time as science can develop a consolidated audit for her conflicting balance-sheets.

At four years, says Professor Giddings, children betray their inferior and imitative and conformist, or else their superior

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and initiative and creative, inheritance. For the former, efficiency. Among the latter we must distinguish between those who win their selfish way by cajolery or coercion and those who "lead" by virtue of their native vitality, mental energy, and character. College, finally, must bar out the unfit by an "infallible test," that of the self-important inferiority which would reach heaven by a single bound. In other words, the self-regarding inferiority complex of genius will no longer fare badly in our routinized college: it will not have got in! Yet if we are not to educate our artists, whom under heaven shall we educate? And this simple, two-block division and subdivision of natural endowments, isn't it quite as superstitious as the old two-block notion of insanity? Does inferiority invariably follow, superiority invariably lead? Or are men complicated bundles of inferiorities and superiorities, for whom education should provide the opportunity to discover their proper capacities?

Warden Bell walks in the way of belief. Not that he does not know and accept the material universe portrayed by science. Yet who, he asks, "would live in a world so petty as to be understandable by the human mind?" Well, as the heckler said to Lady Astor, who wouldn't? Having declined to sacrifice to scientific instruction the introspective heritage of the ages, shall we now sacrifice common sense to religious instruction? Especially when we discover its exponent recognizing the same two-block theory of the educable: "it is only the few with brains who justify keeping school." We really keep school, do we not, to *discover* the few with brains? Whereas Warden Bell would keep school because in it "the thought of the future is being powerfully influenced by the thought of the present." For leadership, that is.

Professor Hart's book is a competent, thorough if repetitious, technical yet humane social criticism of schools past, present, and future. There was a time when education met the needs of the community so closely that the pupil was unconscious of any distinction between schooling and living: his initiation was less a graduation or commencement than a change of pattern in the seamless garment of life. The fundamental trouble with all our present attempts to train the youth for life is that what actually trains for life is living itself. Somehow the schools of the future must "provide those factors of experience which are not already provided by the community," so that education shall be again an integration of living into experience, an interpretation of all of life, instead of a curriculum of historic integrations (the humanities) taught as programs for contemporary living.

I wonder whether this utopianly broad definition has after all accomplished much more than a new name, integration, for an old thing, wisdom—which only fools expect education to communicate. And whether the historic integrations are not perhaps the only important factors of experience not provided by the modern community, as well as the most important things education can present—although that fact in no way justifies their presentation as contemporary programs. The schools, Professor Hart concludes, are themselves helpless, being the political expression of an economic order which prefers arresting development at the 100 per cent American point to producing integrated persons to direct the "community drift." Consequently we lack even educational leadership.

No doubt! Of all the myths of our magic-mindedness this myth of leadership is the most widespread—and (let us be candid) more widespread among liberals than among others. Perhaps no people has ever made such an uncritical din about leaders as the very people who, by the unanimous verdict of these three critics, lack and need them most. Mr. Ayres in his "Holier Than Thou" has, indeed, raised amid the hubbub an almost solo voice to inquire whether leaders really start the waves they ride, but none of these authors has paused to examine the relation between the alleged leader and the led. And if they are unanimous in demanding of education what may be no more than an illusion, that fact betrays their essential unanimity in what must be, for any freedom-loving democracy, an anachronistic hankering after control. The sociologist wants leaders to exorcize superstition. The mystic wants leaders to mysticize the future. The expert wants leaders to meddle with the community drift.

If meddling is not to be the end set education, what is? Well, it seems to me that these critics rather overdo the stressing of ends and the slighting of mere means. Not, of course, that we can do without ends, or ever will. But how much of all that is fine, disinterested, and jolly in the world is a matter of means for their own sake! Indeed, it is almost by definition that a community drifts. There are the myriad ends of its members, and when enough of these lie close together it has a direction. But its one end is continued existence, and its heart beats in the means to that end. The good member will know his own end, appraise his own freedom, and finally by trial and error arrive at his own values. That is what it is to be free. Education should expose him, in the degree of his capacity, to what is thought to be known and, without suppression or distortion by meddlers, to what has been recorded as knowledge.

Professor Hart says children have no thirst for knowledge, but every parent knows that all of them thirst after some of it—and a few seem to thirst after all of it. That is how we discover "the few with brains." Any good school will turn the others out as soon as they are no longer learning their way. At another point he says, rather inconsistently, that the best thing about our bad schools is that curiosity survives their habit of answering questions not asked, which usually means answering at the wrong time. Curiosity suffereth long, but survives. It was ever the beginning of wisdom. And as yet we have no good substitute for unfettered knowledge as a path to wisdom.

CLARENCE BRITTEN

The Poems of Malcolm Cowley

Blue Juniata. By Malcolm Cowley. Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. $2.

LITERARY generations rise and pass rapidly. To each we allocate as an average lifetime ten or fifteen years. The post-war generation, consequently, is now finishing its course, and critics are already regarding most of the writers whose fame has appeared since 1918 with that mixture of the casual and the respectful which signifies establishment. It would be difficult to find a single book of poems more symptomatic of the experiences of the post-war writers of America than Malcolm Cowley's. In his first collection of verse he has given us a diagram of the sensations and disillusioning conflicts through which the second file of twentieth-century young intellectuals passed. "Blue Juniata" is important not only because it gives us the assembled verse of a new and definitely interesting poet, but because it sets itself up as a self-confessed logbook of literary youth in America during the ten years which followed the war and which came just after the first fruits of our modern literary revival had been harvested. Until a representative of this literary generation produces a book as the sequel to Alfred Kreymborg's record in "Troubadour," this sizable volume will serve as a guidebook to an exciting interval of intellectual and aesthetic adventure.

The poetry in which Mr. Cowley has written this "testament de sa jeunesse" has its ups and downs. It reveals all the variety and unexpectedness of experiment. The inconstancy of its various inspirations is patent on every page. The record of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his childhood carries references to Masters (in The Hill Above the Mine), Sandburg (in Blue Juniata), and the other men who first defined those factors in American experience which revealed to younger poets the forces governing their own development. The European episodes are done now in the manner of German movie expressionism, now in the elliptical style of the *transition* school. The mark of Dos Passos and Lawson is on the later American episodes, while Tumbling Mustard and Memphis Johnny recreate with much commemorative charm the tawdry ballad sentiment of old barn-storming days. But Mr. Cowley is not always writing in reminiscent or satirical mood. He has kept his own voice among the discordant chorus of voices in which the lyric ambitions of so many youthful poets have been drowned. Laurel Mountain and Day Coach are trenchant with a penetrating and original insight. Mediterranean Beach and Two Swans are as clean-cut and alive as anything MacLeish has done, even though they do not depend on his particular devices. The melodies have a lucid beauty which rises out of their cluttered and ruinous impressions, and in one magnificent sonnet, Towers of Song, the volume reaches its climax and gives us one of the finest poems that has been written on New York.

Unlike many poets who at the present moment are being read and quoted with high favor, Mr. Cowley is not devising his tunes with gymnastic agility on a single string. He has obviously submitted to the charms of many influences, and he has managed to go through a period of high excitement in our cultural experience and yet realized a significance in the manifold distractions and vogues that crowded it. He artfully divides his book into six sections, providing them with dates and notes which reveal—along with certain traits of self-consciousness in the poems themselves—a sharp awareness of the characteristic quality of his experiences. A quarter-century of national life is pretty well preserved here: the transition from country to town, war fever, jazz-age, trans-Atlantic wanderlust, rediscovery of the American spirit.

Upon this rich substance we may expect him to draw in his future work. His stature as a poet—observant, alive, and sharply sensitive—is already revealed. He will undoubtedly make use of his equipment by writing somewhat more independently of his generation's peculiar ordeal (not, we hope, by losing his enthusiasm and engaging candor), and so become a poet eloquent and strong enough to succeed our present declining worthies.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL

Labor and Internationalism

Labor and Internationalism. By Lewis L. Lorwin. The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

THIS is one of the most valuable books produced by the Institute of Economics. Dr. Lorwin has put into it immense knowledge and great skill of exposition. Most laborers are still local in their personal attachments. Nationalism means little to them, internationalism less. But in the more advanced industrial nations a common consciousness has been slowly emerging during the past century which has taken shape in various fumbling contacts. Until comparatively recent times this consciousness was little more than a dim ideal in the souls of small groups of men, mostly in the great cities of Western Europe. The councils and congresses of the First International and their political-economic activities were almost negligible as judged from the standpoint of achievement. The close study Dr. Lorwin gives to this period is chiefly serviceable in showing the rifts in the trade unionist, syndicalist, socialist, communist, anarchist contributions to a workers' conscious will to power. The attempts to weld these diverse forces into effective solidarity are described in considerable detail, making the history difficult to follow from its sheer complexity. Splits, adjustments, alliances, "united fronts" are numerous, and Dr. Lorwin's minute studies will chiefly be of use for purposes of consultation by specialists in this historical field.

It is quite otherwise with the latter half of his volume. While still intricate and fluid, the internationalism of labor assumes both a clearer consciousness and a stronger reality. Though the immediate sequel of the Great War was a closer, keener nationalism, with tariff barriers and obstructions to migration of workers, internationalism has been greatly enhanced as a practical goal of world-progress both in politics and economics, while the union of political and industrial movements in this direction has made notable advances. Dr. Lorwin in his later chapters gives exceedingly valuable accounts of the relations between "Amsterdam" and the labor institutions of Geneva, on the one hand, Russian Communism upon the other. His analysis of what is termed Marx-Leninism is an exceedingly fine performance. The general result is to show the enormous difficulties in the way of any common, consistent, energetic cooperation on a world-scale. Even in Britain, trade and local sectionalism usually cripples national solidarity. In the United States close nationalism is fortified by a rooted distrust of European revolutionary notions, and an unwillingness to attempt to utilize the state and its political machinery for economic ends. Race, religion, class, and industrial cleavages of aim and interest in each country still consume so much of the energy of working-class movements that, except for brief emergencies, international cooperation still remains a feeble force for the achievement of a great world society.

J. A. HOBSON

A Boswell to Foch

Foch Speaks. By Major Charles Bugnet. Lincoln MacVeagh. The Dial Press. $3.

MAJOR BUGNET became aide-de-camp to Foch in 1921, after the World War, and remained in that capacity until Foch's death. From the time when his personal association with the Marshal began, he seems to have made himself a kind of Boswell to his chief, extracting from Foch, by discreet questioning or suggestion, whatever Foch was willing to divulge about his military training, his theories of warfare, his opinions about the great war and those who took part in it, and his general philosophy of life. Eventually, if not at first, Foch come to know what was going on, and there is abundant indication that he consciously aided in the undertaking, but he refused to allow any part of what was set down to be published during his lifetime, "to avoid the possible suggestion that it had been dictated."

The material which Major Bugnet offers falls roughly into three parts. The first and longest comprises Foch's remarks about the theory or practice of war and the intellectual or moral principles of life to which he had endeavored to adhere. Such headings as "one must see things as they are," "whatever you do, you must do well, no matter how unimportant it is," "it is not I, but necessity, that commands," "when one knows what one wills, everything becomes easy," "one's value consists only in what one does," indicate pretty well the character of the man. Foch, to use the popular phrase, was as hard as nails. He won his way to supreme command solely by merit. "What distinguished him were his long preparation, his dogged labor, his coolness and his judgment, his 'active tenacity,' his unprejudiced and flexible intelligence, his mastery of himself, his practice of simplification and his wide view of a situation as a whole, the application of method by energy, and, above all, his deter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mination to achieve his aims, which was stronger than all the thousands of wills opposed to his own."

The second part of the book offers a brief sketch of Foch's career previous to the World War, while in the third the author takes him on an imaginary tour of the war area as a device for recording his comments upon campaigns and leaders and his general conclusions about the great struggle. The most interesting parts of this latter section are those in which Foch explains the circumstances which led to his selection for the supreme command, and the references to his intimate friendship with General Weygand. The work of translation, by Russell Green, has been admirably done.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

Books in Brief

What Is Socialism? By Jessie Wallace Hughan. Vanguard Press. 50 cents.

We commend this little book to Herbert Hoover and to all others who ought to know what socialism is but don't. Dr. Hughan has summarized in lucid fashion the Socialist case against capitalism and the remedies which the Socialists propose. She defines socialism as "the political movement of the working class which aims to abolish exploitation by means of the collective ownership and democratic management of the basic instruments of production and distribution." Then she proceeds to sketch in detail just how the American Socialist Party would accomplish its purpose, beginning with the revision of the Constitution and ending with the socialization of basic industries. While her treatment is not so brilliant as the Webbs's "Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain" it should be equally useful for Americans because of its American approach. An interesting chapter is included which sketches the recent history of the Socialist movement in European countries.

Die Kunst des 20. Jahrhunderts. Von Dr. Carl Einstein. Berlin. Propyläen-Verlag. 48 R. M.

This Propyläen-Kunstgeschichte series, to be complete in sixteen volumes of which eleven are now ready, is probably the finest thing of the sort ever published. The first volume contained the pictorial records of prehistoric man. The present volume, covering the quarter-century just past, carries more than four hundred reproductions, of which forty are colored inserts. Dr. Einstein's introduction, which would make a bulky volume in itself, is a praiseworthy effort to make clear even to the lay intelligence the whence, why, and whither of the modern artistic experiments which began with impressionism. Dr. Einstein is extremely cautious in his judgments, and assumes that his function is for the most part only that of a cicerone. An admirable guide he is, and the book will prove uniquely useful.

Mortal Men. By Burnham Carter. Albert and Charles Boni. $2.50.

This book is typical of the pleasant inconsequential entertainment that is offered by the general run of contemporary American novels. Wise, witty, and modern-minded, Mr. Carter's fictional excursus on the sons of the wealthy seldom rises above readability. He manages his characters with professional skill. His attitude is wholesome, constructive, and always intelligent. Through the cultured, if somewhat bored, eyes of Allan Levering the spirit of the plutocrat is reflected. His father, the most detestable person in the novel, is the only one who achieves the dimension of artistic reality. The others are pompous and stiff.

INTERNATIONAL RIVALRIES IN MANCHURIA

By Paul H. Clyde

A timely book on the Manchurian question—a thorough study since the year 1689.

". . . and I must say that I find it the best work on the subject that has yet been done."—*George E. Sokolsky, Far Eastern Review.*

"The first book which deals with the subject in a scientific manner—narrative, critical, and conclusive in character." — *China Weekly Review.*

FINLAND
THE REPUBLIC
FARTHEST NORTH

By Eugene Van Cleef

Second Edition Revised

$3.00

"In its sweep of the country and its interpretation of the people the book is a miracle of completeness . . . providing a real story for those who admire the heroic struggle for nationality of a small but vigorous race."—*Robert McBride,* Editor of *Travel.*

It is . . . "the result of investigation by scientific methods, and is far more interesting and more satisfactory than the usual superficial travel book."— *The New York Times.* $2.50

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Columbus, Ohio

A Cultural Vagabondage

Thru

Soviet Russia

with MICHAEL GOLD

via

LONDON · COPENHAGEN · HELSINFORS

and 10 days in LENINGRAD and MOSCOW

To study the new theatres in the Soviet Union—Interviews and talks with Eisenstein, Mayakowsky, Lunacharsky and other noted writers, producers and directors.

SAILING—SEPT. 28—on the S.S. ROTTERDAM $488

Inquire:

175 Fifth Ave.
Flatiron Bldg.
NEW YORK

WORLD TOURISTS INC.

Telephone
ALGONQUIN
6656

CHICAGO • MOSCOW • TOKIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Films

There *Are* Silent Pictures

THE sense of physical discomfort—the jarring of rasping sounds on one's ear—is still one of the things we have to put up with in witnessing the slow progress of the talking picture. In this respect the silent picture can proudly point to its freedom of anything that "hurts the eyes"—a freedom of not more than ten years' standing, but today absolute and taken for granted. And yet, in spite of this great advantage over the talking picture, it is enough to see a few silent specimens of Hollywood's most ambitious efforts to understand the failure of the silent picture to stem the advancing tide of its noisy rival.

There are on Broadway at present three silent "specials" of Hollywood manufacture: "Four Feathers," "Evangeline," and "The Single Standard." Conventional and stereotyped as they are, they have the quality of their defect—the characteristic Hollywood workmanship which reveals itself in smoothness of action, skilful casting of character parts, and splendid photography. The defect itself, however, is too fundamental to be neutralized or even disguised by its superficial attractions. The standardization of form and the resulting moronization of content rob the Hollywood picture of that flexibility of treatment which is essential to effective dramatic statement. Just at the moment when the situation would seem to call for some striking, directly impressive effect, the Hollywood producer, chained to his conventions, calls in the orchestra and the sound machine and thinks he has done his duty. The three pictures mentioned above are no exception to this rule. Not only do they expound stories which are puerile (the heroics of "Four Feathers" are simply inept) but they fail to produce even the crude thrill of a dramatic climax. "Evangeline," though a little more advanced in its technique, is dramatically the least convincing of the three. "Four Feathers" has a few minor thrills supplied by scenes of wild animal life in Africa; but they are rather artificially connected with the main theme of the story and contribute but very little to its dramatic development. As for "The Single Standard," it is largely Miss Greta Garbo—take it or leave it. For our part we are inclined to leave it.

But Hollywood does not hold a monopoly on cinematic ineffectiveness as we are reminded by frequent foreign importations which find refuge in the so-called little cinema theaters. There is "Nana," for instance, which, we are informed, was "produced in France by Jean Renoir, son of the distinguished French impressionist painter, with the cooperation of members of Emile Zola's family." Shades of Renoir père and Emile Zola! Are they to be held responsible for this talentless concoction undistinguished by a single cinematic quality and marred by terrible overacting in the part of Nana, who is made not merely vulgar, as well she should be, but singularly unattractive to boot?

As a specimen of the cinematic sterility of English producers there was recently "The Constant Nymph"—acclaimed as a masterpiece in England but more accurately described as a Hollywood average of ten years ago—insensitive, flat, and amateurish. It was a relief after this to see "Piccadilly," another picture made in England though directed by A. E. Dupont, the famous German director of "Variety." Here was genuine workmanship and unmistakable sense of cinematic values. Dupont's tempo is sometimes too slow, he lingers too fondly over details of small dramatic significance, but he does produce a flow of images which merge imperceptibly into one another—a dynamic quality best illustrated in Eisenstein's "Potemkin"—

DODSWORTH
Sinclair Lewis *$2.50*

THE MAGIC ISLAND
William B. Seabrook *$3.50*

MIDDLETOWN
R. S. and H. M. Lynd *$5.00*

THE MODERN TEMPER
Joseph Wood Krutch *$2.50*

SLAVES OF THE GODS
Katherine Mayo *$2.50*

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY
383 Madison Avenue, New York

CAIN, or The Future of Crime
By G. Godwin

WHAT lay behind the recent prison riots? What is wrong with our system of punishment? Four escape from Dannemora—prisoners riot and burn Clinton storehouse—Leavenworth in uproar. Find out why the "eye for an eye" theory has never worked; find out the only cure that will work. A new and stimulating addition to the Today and Tomorrow series of deepest significance to every man and woman interested in human society. $1.00

THE BOY PROPHET
By Edmond Fleg

WHEN Claude Levy is five years old, a priest glances at him and murmurs, "What a pity." "Is it a pity to be a Jew?" he asks himself. Here is a book of bitter truths, of beauty, of inner struggle, written with disarming frankness. $2.00

SHORT STORIES OUT OF SOVIET RUSSIA
Compiled and translated by John Cournos

SIXTEEN dramatically interesting short stories of life in the new Russia, by twelve of the new revolutionary writers. $2.50

E. P. DUTTON & CO., Inc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and he does convey the sense of cinematic unity and balance. Unfortunately the cheap "mystery" ending of the story utterly spoils the dramatic movement of the film, coming almost as an anti-climax. The acting in "Piccadilly" is also above the average English standard, particularly that of King Ho-Chang, who plays "Jim," and of Anna May Wong, impersonating the Chinese dancer.

Of other current silent pictures "The Fight for Matterhorn," at the Little Carnegie Playhouse, deserves notice for striking photography and interesting natural scenery. Its drama does not come to much, but at any rate it is unobjectionable.

The most interesting silent picture, however, that has reached Broadway for some time is "In Old Siberia," at the Cameo. It is a strange film with many obvious faults. The contrast between the brutal tyrannies of prison officials toward their prisoners and the petty diversions of these prison officials against the background of provincial society—an excellent idea in itself—somehow is never translated into dramatic unity; the two themes remain separate. The characters are exaggeratedly grotesque types and their make-up is frequently crude. But in spite of these deficiencies, "In Old Siberia" is a fresh and stimulating picture. It has remarkable atmospheric effects secured with a moving camera (considerably cut, apparently, in the present version) and it shows originality in dramatic treatment. As the first work of a young director, Reisman, it is distinctly promising.

It is rather curious that the defects and qualities of this film should be completely reversed in another remarkable Russian picture not previously noticed here. "The Village of Sin" is the work of a young woman director, Preobrazhenskaya. Compared with Reisman's picture, it shows a rather conventional choice of characters, but unlike the other it succeeds in welding its material into a dramatic unity by means of a treatment which has the quality of sober and somewhat detached factuality, resembling the natural flow of the modern *vèrs libre*. "The Village of Sin" is also distinguished by the remarkable pictorial beauty of some of its scenes, notably of a wind-swept wheat-field.

This occasion is as good as any for referring to a film which, though shown a few months ago, is still eagerly discussed among the movie enthusiasts. There is no denying the fact that "The Passion of Joan of Arc," directed by Carl Dreier and produced in France, is a picture of outstanding originality. Dreier's emphasis on the facial expressions of his characters, who are shown mostly in monumentally sculpturesque close-ups, represents a technique which is decidedly fresh and unconventional, as is his use of the camera, which is made to follow the characters as if it were the eyes of a seated spectator watching the trial. Thus the whole drama is unfolded before us as if we were actually present in the court. The result of this peculiar use of the camera can hardly be described as cinematically, as well as dramatically, successful. The restricted camera movement retards the action and gives the picture a decided static quality. The method of conveying dramatic development by means of changes in facial expression lends further emphasis to this static quality. Thus, instead of finding an adequate cinematic form in which to show the mental tortures of Joan and the reactions of her prosecutors, Dreier has reduced the drama of the situation to rather obvious facial mimics illustrating the dialogue titles which are thus made to bear the whole burden of dramatic movement. Clearly, the picture should have been made as a talkie. Dreier deserves, however, all credit for his extraordinary photography and must be complimented on the daring with which he has flouted the Holywood formulas. Few producers seem to have the courage and originality to do so.

ALEXANDER BAKSHY

□ THEATERS □ CINEMA □

Starting this Saturday, Aug. 17
FIRST SHOWING IN AMERICA

FILM GUILD CINEMA
52 WEST 8th STREET, Bet. 5th and 6th Aves.
Continuous—Noon to Midnight. Spring 5090-5095
Last 3 Days—Wed., Thurs., Fri., Aug. 14-15-16
"At the South Pole" and "6½ x 11"

GILBERT MILLER
(by arrangement with Maurice Browne)
presents
Journey's End
By R. C. Sheriff
HENRY MILLER'S THEATRE, 124 West 43rd Street
Eves. at 8:30. Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:30

★ ★ SOON SEPTEMBER ★ ★

and if you, a landlord, have an apartment or house to lease, this is the time to tell those readers of *The Nation* who are house-or-apartment-hunting, what you have to offer.

We have a folder of letters, unsolicited testimony, of the results gotten from advertising in *The Nation* (comparative results—better in *The Nation* than in leading newspapers).

Rates on request

THE NATION
Advertising Department
20 VESEY STREET, N. Y. FITZROY 9074

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Reparations: The Young and Dawes Plans

By WILLIAM MacDONALD

THE controversy which has developed in the international conference at The Hague over the so-called Young plan of reparations settlement makes opportune a summary review of the reparations issue, and in particular a comparison of the provisions of the Young plan and those of the Dawes plan which it would supersede.

Until the Young plan was drawn up, no agreement had been reached by representatives of the Allied Powers and Germany regarding the total amount of reparations which Germany should pay. The treaty of Versailles directed the Reparations Commission to accept from Germany, in acknowledgment of Germany's obligations and as security for their discharge, three issues of bonds: one of 20,000,000,000 gold marks, payable without interest not later than May, 1921; a second of 40,000,000,000 gold marks, bearing interest at 2½ per cent from 1921 to 1926, and thereafter at 5 per cent, and a third of 40,000,000,000 gold marks to be issued whenever the Commission was satisfied that the interest and sinking-fund payments could be met. Further issues might also be provided for, in the discretion of the Commission, in accordance with the amount of damages to be made good and the ability of Germany to pay.

In April, 1921, the Commission made public what is known as the London schedule, providing for the issuance, subject to interest and sinking-fund requirements, of 12,000,000,000 gold marks of "A" bonds, 38,000,000,000 gold marks of "B" bonds, and 82,000,000,000 gold marks of "C" bonds; the "C" bonds, however, to be issued only when the Commission should be satisfied that the interest and sinking-fund requirements could be met. Annual payments of 2,000,000,000 gold marks, together with 26 per cent of the value of German exports, were required. It was not the intention of the Commission that the three bond issues should represent the total of reparations to be exacted from Germany, but there is still a general impression that the total had been fixed at 132,000,000,000 gold marks.

In the meantime the Allies, at the Spa conference in July, 1920, had agreed that France should receive 52 per cent of the receipts from reparations, Great Britain 22 per cent, Italy 10 per cent, Belgium 8 per cent, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Rumania together 6½ per cent, and Portugal and Japan each ¾ of one per cent. The total of 132,000,000,000 gold marks set out in the London schedule was promptly rejected by Germany as impossible, and was generally so regarded elsewhere, but a voluminous exchange of notes among the governments concerned failed to bring agreement upon any other figure.

On November 30, 1923, the Reparations Commission decided to appoint two commissions of experts, one to consider the means of balancing the German budget and stabilizing the currency, the other to consider "the means of estimating the amount of exported capital and of bringing it back to Germany." The underlying purpose of the inquiries was to enable the Commission to gauge the resources of Germany and its capacity to pay. The outcome of the deliberations of these commissions was the Dawes report, submitted to the Reparations Commission on April 9, 1924, accepted by all the interested governments at the London Conference on August 16, and put into effect on September 1.

The Dawes plan did not undertake to determine the total of reparations that Germany should pay, and expressly avoided any consideration of political interests or factors. Instead, the Commission confined itself to estimating, on the basis of a detailed study of the German economic situation, the maximum annuities that Germany could fairly be expected to pay over a series of years, indicating the sources of revenue from which the annuities should be drawn, drafting plans for stabilizing the currency and balancing the budget, and providing an organization for the administration of the plan.

Under the Dawes plan, three sources of revenue were levied upon for the payment of reparations. The ordinary budget, supplied from the usual sources of taxation, was to furnish after the first year (1924-25) various sums, the contribution from this source in the fifth or normal year (1928-29) being fixed at 1,250,000,000 gold marks. This amount was regarded as a "standard payment," to be increased in subsequent years in accordance with an "index of prosperity" which the plan provided. The German railways were to be reorganized and 11,000,000,000 gold marks of first-mortgage railway bonds were to be issued for reparations purposes, the interest, which was fixed at 5 per cent with one per cent for amortization, rising from 330,000,000 gold marks in 1924-25 to 660,000,000 gold marks in 1927-28 and thereafter. A transport tax of 290,000,000 gold marks, partly for reparations and partly for the German government, was to be paid after 1925-26. The third source of revenue was industrial debentures, to be issued to the amount of 5,000,000,000 gold marks, and bearing interest in the fourth and subsequent years to the amount of 300,000,000 gold marks. To aid in stabilizing the currency and balancing the budget, a foreign loan of $200,000,000, to become available in the first year of the plan, was also provided.

The total annual payments under the Dawes plan began with 1,000,000,000 gold marks in the first year, rose to 2,500,000,000 gold marks in the fifth or normal year, and were to continue at that figure, plus a supplement computed on the index of prosperity, indefinitely thereafter. A transfer committee to supervise the transfer of payments from Germany to the creditor countries, a trustee for railway and industrial bonds, commissioners for the railways, for the reorganized bank, and for the "controlled revenues" specially pledged as collateral security for budget contributions and other payments, and an agent for reparation payments in general charge of the operation of the plan, were also created.

The fifth or normal year of the Dawes plan will end next September. In the five years that have elapsed since the plan was put into operation, the payments called for have been fully and punctually met by Germany, and the machinery of the plan has, in general, worked smoothly. On

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other hand, the insistence of the German Government that the maximum annuity of 2,500,000,000 gold marks was greater than Germany could continue to pay, together with resentment at the prospect of paying that sum or any other for an indefinite number of years while the aggregate amount of the annuities remained undetermined, turned the attention of the creditor governments increasingly towards the necessity of re-examining the Dawes plan and agreeing with Germany upon a reparations total.

On September 16, 1928, accordingly, the British, French, Belgian, Italian, German, and Japanese Governments agreed at Geneva to intrust to "a committee of independent financial experts" the "task of drawing up proposals for complete and final settlement of the reparation problem," the proposals to include "settlement of the obligations resulting from existing treaties and agreements between Germany and the creditor Powers." The committee as finally constituted consisted of fourteen members (a delegate and an alternate from each country), the representatives of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, and Japan being appointed by the Reparations Commission on the nomination of their respective governments, those of Germany by the German Government, and those of the United States by the Reparations Commission and the German Government jointly. The committee met at Paris on February 11, 1929, and chose the American delegate, Owen D. Young, a member of the former Dawes committee, as chairman. The committee completed its labors on June 7.

The Young plan bears something of the same resemblance to the Dawes plan that the Constitution of the United States bears to the older Articles of Confederation. The Dawes plan has been, in a sense, revised, but the revision embodies new principles and important changes in details. The cardinal feature of the Young plan is the replacement of the administrative and controlling machinery of the Dawes plan by a Bank for International Settlements, with powers so comprehensive as to make it not merely an elaborately organized agency for handling reparations, but also, in its potential operations at least, a super-bank. In addition to the usual banking functions (except, apparently, that of doing business with private depositors), and those connected with the receipt, accounting, and transfer of reparation payments, the management of bond issues for the commercialization of a part of the payments, and similar matters, the expectation of the experts' committee is that "in the natural course of development" the bank "will, in time, become an organization not simply or even predominantly concerned with the handling of reparations, but also with furnishing to the world of international commerce and finance important facilities hitherto lacking." To this end the bank, whose directors are to be designated by the central banks of issue of the countries represented on the committee, or by other banks if the central banks cannot or do not act, is authorized to buy and sell gold, conduct intermediate credit operations "in the interest of world trade to the extent that the directors of the bank approve," and be prepared, in so far as the transfer of reparation payments into foreign currencies involves either a restriction of imports or an extension of the German export trade, "to promote the increase of world trade by financing projects, particularly in undeveloped countries, which might otherwise not be attempted through the ordinary existing channels."

The Young plan calls for the payment by Germany, for the thirty-seven years ending March 31, 1966, of annuities aggregating 79,483,300,000 marks. The lowest annuity after March 31, 1930, is 1,685,000,000 marks; the highest and last is 2,428,800,000 marks; the average, inclusive of the service of the Dawes loan, is 2,050,800,000 marks, or 449,200,000 marks less than the present "normal" annuity under the Dawes plan. After 1966, and for the twenty-two years ending March 31, 1988, the annuities correspond to the Allied outpayments on their war debts to the United States, the aggregate of these annuities being 34,422,100,000 marks. The grand total of the annuities is 113,905,400,000 marks, representing an estimated "present value," computing interest at 5½ per cent, of 36,996,000,000 marks.

Of the annuities for the first thirty-seven years, 660,000,000 marks are to be paid unconditionally, without the privilege of postponement, and of this amount 500,000,000 marks is allocated, under certain conditions, to France. The unconditional payments, accordingly, represent the part of the annuities that may be "mobilized" or commercialized by the issuance of bonds. The unconditional part of the annuities is to be secured by a tax on the German railways of 660,000,000 marks, the balance of payments being derived from the German budget. With the approval of an advisory committee of the Bank for International Settlements, payment of the conditional annuities may be postponed for not exceeding two years. The annuities of the last twenty-two years are to be met from a sinking fund created by allocating to the fund 80 per cent of the profits of the bank. In a special memorandum attached to the report, but not forming a part of it, the experts of "the four chief creditor countries and of Germany" recommend an agreement by which, in case the war-debt requirements are reduced, two-thirds of the relief shall be credited to Germany and one-third to the creditor countries.

Deliveries in kind are to continue for ten years, but with a progressive reduction from 750,000,000 marks in the first year to 300,000,000 marks in the tenth, the committee having recognized "the necessity for maintaining a transitional period so that all shock to existing economic conditions in Germany should be avoided." The proceeds of reparation recovery acts, under which special duties have been imposed upon imports from Germany, or of any systems that have been substituted for the acts by agreement with Germany, are to be reckoned as deliveries in kind.

Upon the approval and inauguration of the Young plan the machinery of the Dawes plan will cease to operate. The "index of prosperity" will disappear, the duties of the Reparations Commission, the Agent for Reparation Payments, and all other foreign officials engaged in administering the Dawes plan will end, and all foreign control of the economic life of Germany will be withdrawn. The committee recommend that a general liquidation of all financial questions raised by the war be undertaken by the creditor governments and Germany "in a broad spirit of mutual concession," that no further seizure, retention, or liquidation of German property be made, and that the creditor Powers "abstain from recovering the credits of Germany against her former allies referred to in Article 261 of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany for her part renouncing any net balance which might be due to her as a result of these credits."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED